

native opinion
1895


Librarian
Krishna Public Library

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
Note	
BOMBAY.	
Native Opinion	1 & 156
Kaiser-i-Hind *	21 & 149
Gujarati... ..	40
Indu Prakash	67
Prabhakar	84
Subodha Prakash	87
SURAT.	
Gujarat Mitra	91
POONA.	
Soodharak	94
The Mahratta	97
Dnyan Prakash	115
CALCUTTA.	
Amrita Bazaar Patrika	120
Indian Mirror]	133
Hindu Patriot	137
Madras Standard (Madras)	139
Tribune (Lahore)	141
Vidyavilas (Kolhapoor)	143
Dharwar Vritta (Dharwar)	144
Kalpataru (Sholapur)	145
Nyayasindu (Ahmednagar)	146
The Chikitsaka (Belgaon)	147
The Raghav Bhushan (Yeola)	148
Lay of a Lordly Cricketer	158
Compiler's Note	158

GUJARATI NEWSPAPERS.

BOMBAY.	
Bombay Samachar	1
Jam-e-Jamshed	23
Akhbar-e-Soudagar	47
East Gostar	60
Hindi Punch	72
Gujarati	86

NOTE.

If there still be left any doubt in the popular mind as to the general failure of Lord Harris's administrative career, it is to be presumed that it will be entirely dispelled by a perusal of this compilation which gives in a collective form the numerous notices that appeared on the subject during the past few weeks in the leading organs of Native public opinion in the Presidency and elsewhere. Never during the last hundred years has a Governor of Bombay been so sternly criticised and never has he met with such widespread unpopularity on account of his administration as Lord Harris. And yet it is astonishing to observe the way in which speaker after speaker eulogised it at the meeting of His Lordship's friends and admirers which was held in the Town Hall on 29th January last. The eulogy would have been justifiable had its object been deserving. But it is admitted in all quarters where his Lordship's career has been discussed calmly and impartially, without passion or prejudice or partisan spirit, that there was no substantial foundation in fact for the panegyrists to have spoken of it in the terms they did. On the contrary, it would be seen from the following pages that not only was it unjustifiable but fallacious. It would be perverting the judgment of History to allow the Town Hall proceedings to pass unchallenged. For History must depend for its accuracy on facts related by contemporary chroniclers. But if the chroniclers give inaccurate accounts or misrepresent facts, the verdict of History, too, would be inaccurate and misleading. Addressing the graduates at the convocation of the University on the 12th Instant Lord Harris himself gave the counsel of perfection that "there are two sides to most questions." This compilation cannot, therefore, be considered to be superfluous after such good advice. Under the circumstances it is essential in the interests of truth that the opinion entertained by the vast majority of the population, as voiced in their accredited public organs, should be found the widest publicity possible. It is to be hoped that this compilation would achieve that object and make it clear how artificial and hollow have been the demonstrations made by a handful of Lord Harris's friends and admirers and how far his administration has been unsuccessful, unsympathetic and unpopular.

Bombay, 16th February 1895.

Opinions of the Indian Press on Lord Harris's administration and the Hollowness of the Permanent Memorial in his honor by his "Friends and Admirers."

NATIVE OPINION.

(ANGLO-VERNACULAR.)

I.

MEMORIAL TO LORD HARRIS.

If the present mania for statues and memorials goes on unchecked on the lines of least deservedness, it will not be long before we shall be obliged to exclaim with Cato that the test of real merit and good service has come to be the absence of a statue. We have commented on several previous occasions on movements set on foot to effect such purposes, but we believe we have had as yet no occasion to come across any really such undeserved movement as we are informed is going on amongst us at present. The public opinion of Western India was sufficiently scandalised by the information that about Rs. 11,000 were raised in Kathiawar by the Chiefs in that territory as a contribution towards a fund with the object of raising a statue to Lord Harris. But our further information opens to us a vista of so humiliating a spectacle that had it not been for the reliableness of our sources of information, we would never have been able to conceive it. It is said that two gentlemen of position and status have bestirred themselves in the matter and have sent out letters to the following effect :—

His Excellency the Right Honourable Lord Harris G. C. I. E. leaves this country early next year on the expiration of his term of office as Governor of Bombay.

There is a general desire on the part of the various communities to testify fitly before his departure to the high and sincere esteem in which His Excellency is held. His straightforward and manly intercourse has struck all those whose privilege it has been to come across him. It is proposed that some permanent memorial, as a token of the esteem in which His Excellency has been held be raised. May we ascertain if your Highness is prepared to take a prominent part in the movement and to allow your name to appear in the list of contributors?

If, as is expected, the answers to the preliminary appeal are favourable, then a public meeting will hereafter be held at which the announcement of your Highness' subscription will be made and the whole matter brought before the public.

An early answer is solicited.

We remain with the utmost respect,
Your Highness'
Most dutiful and obedient servants,
(Sd.) A. F. BEAUFORT,
(Sd.) NOWROSJI N. WADIA.

Please address reply to
The Honourable
NOWROSJI N. WADIA,
Tardeo, Bombay.

Now far be it from us to dictate to individuals how to spend or not to spend their money. So long as their expenditure is of a private character, we are of opinion, that that expenditure ought never to be criticised. But when such an expenditure does not possess a private character but is intended to accentuate public feelings and opinion, it does legitimately come within the domain of public criticism. We have no doubt that just as the Kathiawar Chiefs have subscribed, other Chiefs of the Presidency will do the same. But that the fact that the Chiefs' payment can never be taken as an indication of the voluntary character of such payments. No Chief is, we may assert, prepared to incur displeasure for a few hundred rupees and nobody can conceive that a proposal like this could be rejected without displeasing somebody in a high place. And whatever might have been the circumstance with respect to other individuals, nobody after reading the lecture Lord Harris gave in Gujarat to a Municipality about expenditure on entertainments to distinguished guests, can conceive that he can afford to reject such a proposal without injuring his own and his family's status and future welfare. Lord Harris may be really perfectly indifferent to such refusals. We can even assert that he is indifferent. But that is not the point of view from which such a proposal is likely to be looked at by the Chiefs.

As regards the merits of the proposal we think that at all events among the native public there can be no two opinions, with some exceptions, that it is entirely undeserved and is calculated to heap ridicule upon the native community. We are told that His Excellency is frank and manly. We never doubted that. But we have also never doubted that those qualities alone are not sufficient to support such a proposal. Lord Harris is a good cricketer, he is a good sportsman perhaps riding to the hounds better than any Englishman in the Bombay Presidency. But statues ought never to be erected for such and ought always to be reserved for the purpose of commemorating the names of individuals who have performed eminent and distinguished services to the public. But when we look to Lord Harris' career as the Governor of Bombay we not only miss those distinguished services, but on the contrary we find such an entire want of capacity and such utter disregard of public opinion that we had wished in the interest of His Lordship's reputation that this movement had never been begun. Had his friends left His Lordship alone perhaps his want of capacity and his want of service would never have been so much exposed. His Lordship will most assuredly have to cry "Save me from my friends."

25th November 1894.

II.

CHEAP MEMORIALS.

People must know that cheap memorials have no value and when these are showered without discrimination, public men are never tempted to strive hard and win them. For such an honour as a statue or some other memorial to mark one's memory, highest public usefulness must be made the standard, be the person whose memory is to be marked howsoever great. These things are not to be done either by a momentary impulse or under external influence; the generality of people must feel that the individual has been really useful and the movement set on foot must be quite voluntary. But in India these things are done in a very different manner, and princes and chiefs, who have to bow down to every summons from above do subscribe pretty freely despite the fact that they often know about the person as little as of the man in the Moon. And did not Bombay vote a statue to Sir Richard Temple, and quite recently were not the treasures of the Indian princes ransacked for a Memorial to the ex-Viceroy? And now it is seriously proposed, they say, to perpetuate the memory of Lord Harris. We are

ready to do ample justice to his Lordship for his out-spokenness and his honesty of purpose, but we are constrained to say that his services have not been such as to deserve a commemoration. For our part we are against public memorials to Government servants, who are called upon to do their duty and are, in return, more than remunerated. Are not these memorials a double tax on the purses of the people? On principle, subscriptions from native states appear to us to be a diversion of public funds, to which the people of the states alone have an exclusive right. At least voluntariness ought to be the essence of every memorial and this element alone can justify it, be the recipient the Governor of a Presidency or the humblest peasant. However we are pained to find some proofs for a conviction that altogether an opposite course seems to have been looked upon with favour and pursued. We do not care to take the trouble of proving how forced memorials are utterly worthless, so far as those, who are thus perpetuated, are concerned, nor do we care to know whether they can possibly be a source of true pleasure to them. But we would fain be enlightened if the recipients of such memorials understood their responsibility well enough to assure themselves that their attitude as it becomes manifest in calmly accepting them or in apparent connivance at those who, generally of course of their own accord, work hard to raise them, did not contain an element likely to aggravate dissatisfaction or create a dislike among people for a race or a Government for which they entertain the feeling of heartfelt gratitude and genuine admiration and love. Then we think that they are bound to satisfy themselves that such tokens of admiration or respect or love have not been obtained at even the smallest sacrifice of justice and fair-play. But we need not go further into the subject here as we have done, we hope, ample justice to it elsewhere.

25th November 1891.

III.

BOMBAY CITIZENS AND THE PROPOSED MEMORIAL.

What the hole and corner meeting, held at the Mazagaon castle, may have resolved upon is not known. But dame rumour says that the memorialists mean to hold a "public" meeting. Lord Harris is straight-forward and by this time he must be saying to himself "Save me from my friends." But it is the hankering after the Insignia tinsel and other temptations for

Government honours that seem to encourage these so-called representatives of the Bombay people to utilise the retiring Governor to their own advantage. If the whole Native Press be any evidence of a people's opinions in this matter, then no memorial without any element of spontaneity in it can ever be the people's, let the talkers be howsoever loud in their protestations. And did the Bombay people ever express their wish in meeting assembled for any perpetuation? Certainly the native chiefs, whose public treasuries have been tapped, and this process is certainly unjust to their peoples, surely do not represent the people of this Presidency, much less of Bombay. And yet these vociferous men will persist in saying that the movement is from the people, and they are only their mouth-pieces. If the Bombay people want a memorial, let them do it themselves, and not thrust one on them. Will the memorialists still wait and reconsider the matter betimes?

16th December 1894.

IV.

ENTERTAINMENT TO LORD HARRIS.

As stated in the local dailies, a meeting of some gentlemen under the presidency of the Hon'ble Mr. R. M. Sayani, was held at *Gulistan*, the residence of Khan Bahadur M. C. Murzban C. I. E., to consider the question of ways and means. Though we do not oppose any entertainment-proposal, we have been from the first against any public demonstration, and awkward as the position of Dr. Bahadurji might seem, his protest against any public character being given to the entertainment was, we think, very timely. Dr. Bahadurji told the meeting that he himself was a great admirer of Lord Harris as a cricketer, and expressed his willingness to subscribe to the entertainment and shield funds if only the idea was kept within its legitimate aspect. Of course Dr. Bahadurji was ruled out of order, but those who endeavoured to silence him ought to have known that there is no crime in placing before a meeting one's own views howsoever unsavoury they might be to others. No one need cavil if Lord Harris' friends and admirers think fit to honour him with a demonstration, but the public has a right to object if any individual fancies are attempted to be converted into public affairs. Monday's meeting appears to have had a very mysterious genesis. There was no doubt a talk a few days ago of an entertainment to be given to Lord Harris for his encouragement to physical education and sports, but no one thought it was to be a public entertain-

ment. Invitation cards were issued to a limited number of persons and the prevalent belief was that the entertainment was to be given by sportsmen to a sporting Governor who had shown his interest in the games beyond what a Governor can be legitimately expected to show. But most of the gentlemen assembled were, we suppose, strangers to cricket & in fact any sports, and we fail to understand the propriety of their meeting to honour Lord Harris in this connection. The attempt to spring up suddenly a public entertainment on the unwary public was anything but creditable to the dignity of the gentlemen assembled, but we are glad that the Hon. Mr. Sayani was wise and prudent enough to save the meeting from degenerating into a clique by dissociating completely Lord Harris' administration as a Governor from the entertainment movement. It would have been still more graceful on the part of the organizers to declare the entertainment not public so as to leave no ground for misunderstanding on the point. We hoped that this unpleasant affair would drop here, but if what we have heard be true, the friends and admirers of Lord Harris appear to be bent upon carrying the meeting to the extreme limits. They are going to hold, we are told, a meeting next Tuesday in the Municipal Hall to resolve upon a statue for His Lordship. Whether this is to be a simple meeting of friends and admirers or a public meeting we do not know; but if we can judge from the sudden metamorphosis of the entertainment proposal, we are quite certain the statue-meeting also may not burst forth at any time into a full-blown public meeting of all castes and creeds. The public ought therefore to be on their guard this time, that they may not be surprised one morning with an account in the papers how their co-opted representatives had voted a statue to Lord Harris the previous evening. We are glad, however, to note that a counter-movement is also set on foot to prevent mischief and save the public the discredit of any statue being fathered upon them.

10th January 1895.

V.

LORD HARRIS AND HIS FRIENDS AND ADMIRERS.

THE long-talked of, but often denied, movement to commemorate the retiring Governor's connection with this Presidency has, at last, been practically set on foot. It seems to be labouring, however, under evil

stars. In the beginning there were rumours, though they were stigmatized as baseless, that pressure unofficial though it has been was being brought to bear upon Chiefs to subscribe handsomely to the fund that is being collected. Then the meeting was to be held in the Corporation Hall, but that could not be done. A protest appeared from some twenty-five members against the use of the Hall for the purpose, without the permission of the Corporation. It had, therefore, to be held elsewhere and the friends and admirers met in the office of the Chamber of Commerce. The meeting, too, was poorly attended, and very few representatives of the intellectual aristocracy were present. The promoters of the day-before-yesterday's meeting—Mr. Acworth, Mr. Beaufort, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Fazulbhai Vishram, Mr. N. N. Wadia, and Mr. Hurkissondas Narottandas—seem to be very shrewd men. Perhaps they did not like the element capable of protesting to be there, and so it was kept out. There was, moreover, very little speech-making. Mr. Acworth was honoured with the chair, and he commenced business with reading telegrams and letters of sympathy from the Bishop of Bombay, Sir Jamsetji Jeejeebhoy, Mr. S. M. Moses, and Dastur Hoshang Jamaspiji. He did not consider it necessary to make a long opening speech. It was expected that he would take opportunity to expatiate upon the claims Lord Harris is alleged to have for commemoration. But preferring golden silence in the matter, he simply informed those assembled that they had then only to put upon a business footing the movement in question, and this was done by the adoption of Mr. Uloth's proposition, seconded by Mr. Karimbhai Ibrahim, for a meeting of friends and admirers of Lord Harris on the 29th instant at the Town Hall, and the formation of those assembled into a provisional committee to settle the resolutions to be submitted to it. The friends and admirers of Lord Harris seem to have gone to their work zealously, and their industry and activity promise to be well-rewarded. They have succeeded so far as to collect Rs. 25,000 and this sum they may be depended upon to augment considerably. They are very energetic and they will do their best to make the meeting a complete success. They have shrewdly warded off all possibility of opposition by confining the meeting, following the precedent laid down by those who commemorated Sir Richard Temple, to friends and admirers. This is a relief to the public, and for affording it, it will be grateful to them. The public has been saved the painful necessity of entering an emphatic protest, which it would have had to do, if popular shape had been attempted to be given to the movement. Friends and admirers of anybody are at liberty to do what they like for their idol. The public have nothing to do with them. It will be sorry that it cannot do anything

for the retiring Governor. An honour from the public is more valuable than one from friends and admirers, and it is a pity Lord Harris should not have merited it. His Lordship is frank himself, and will not, therefore, dislike frankness in others. The public frankly refuses to join the movement to commemorate him, because it is of opinion that his work does not deserve recognition from it, and Lord Harris and his friends and admirers have no cause to grumble. If Lord Harris had endeared himself to the public by his deeds, it would have honoured him in a hearty manner, but his career has been marked by glaring mistakes. To give only a few examples—he has not worked the new Councils Act liberally. He has not curbed the overzeal of the revision settlement officers. He has not dealt with the deplorable riots in a prudent and statesman-like manner. He has not sympathized with the aspirations of the people in the various directions. In short, whether through innate weakness or otherwise, he has not been able to do any signal service to the people under his charge for five years, except in the matter of physical education, and that is readily acknowledged. Is the public, therefore, to be blamed for dissociating itself from the movement to commemorate him? Certainly not.

17th January 1895.

VI.

PROTEST BY THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATORS AGAINST THE USE OF THE MUNICIPAL HALL.

Bombay, 12th January 1895.

To

H. A. Acworth Esq. I. C. S.,

Municipal Commissioner,

Bombay.

Sir,

We understand that you have given the use of the Municipal Hall for holding a preliminary meeting on Tuesday the 15th Inst. in connection with the proposed Lord Harris Memorial. We think you have no power to give the use of the Hall for any such meeting without any

reference to the Corporation and we have accordingly the honor hereby to strongly protest against your doing so.

We have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servants.

Dinshaw Eduljee Wachha,
 Bhulchandra Krishna,
 Chimanlal H. Setalwad,
 M. G. Deshmukh,
 Jagmohandas Vundravandas,
 N. N. Katruk,
 Bhailshankar Nanabhay,
 Ardeshir F. Unwalla,
 Khurshedjee Nassurwanjee Wadia,
 Javerilal U. Yajnik,
 Ardeshir Dadabhai Mody,
 Ibrahim Rahimtoola,
 Nann N. Kothare,
 K. M. Shroff,
 Jamsheetjee Kurshetjee Cama,
 N. J. Gamadia,
 Manekshah J. Taleyarkhan,
 Eknath R. Khote,
 Kaikhushroo N. Kabraji,

"In my humble opinion too permission ought to have been obtained from Corporation before the Hall was given to be used for any other purpose than a Municipal one. I support this protest in view of the principal involved in defence of our Municipal Constitution."

Badroodin Abdoola Koor,

"I quite agree with Mr. Koor."

D. B. Master,
 Accacio G. Viegas,
 Bomanji Rustumji Master,
 Dinshaw Bomonji Pestanji Master,
 K. N. Badhurji.

VII.

LORD HARRIS AND THE UNIVERSITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "NATIVE OPINION."

Sir,—It appears Lord Harris' bosom has been full of very important sentiments on the eve of his departure home and that he had been for some time past rather anxious for opportunities to unburthen himself of his surging feelings before the public. The wicked public, however, would not give him this opportunity and even the local University seemed indifferent to the advantage of listening to a very learned academical address from His Excellency at the ensuing Convocation. Changing the date of the Convocation was a small matter which could have been disposed of within five minutes and it was really discourteous on Prof. Hathornthwaite's part to draw back at the last moment by declining to move the proposition standing in his name when a special meeting of the Senate had been called for the purpose. The Members of the Senate set some value on their time I suppose; but it is certainly trifling with them to call them together for a business with all the pomp and formality of a special meeting and then declare after they have assembled that as the particular end can be brought about in some other way their help is no longer needed and they might go home if they liked. It is hinted that the supporters of the proposal were afraid of a scone which the strength of the supposed opposition made them to apprehend, and that they thought it safer to retire in time than to court a defeat by pressing the point. It cannot be said whether there is any truth in this guess, but if there is, the conduct of the supporters of the proposal does not reflect much credit on their valour or prudence. The excuse given for the withdrawal of Mr. Hathornthwaite's proposition is that the Vice-Chancellor had power to fix on the date for the annual Convocation, but there are grave doubts as to whether the wording of the Bye-Law 36 supports any such theory. I hope, therefore, the Vice-Chancellor will take proper legal advice as to the meaning of the Bye-law, if he of course has any intention of convening the Convocation earlier for the convenience of Lord Harris. The public in general does not care a bit whether the annual Convocation is held on the 12th or the 19th of February; but the point to be considered in this matter is whether it is worth while to put hundred other persons to inconvenience as the antedating of the Convocation would very likely do, simply to afford Lord Harris the satisfac-

tion of presiding at the annual Convocation and delivering an address. We do not expect much learning in an address coming from His Excellency, nor is it very probable that the last utterances of Lord Harris will breathe more cordiality of feeling and sympathy for the people than he has been able to show during his quinquennial administration. Why then trouble oneself by anticipating the annual Convocation a week earlier for the sake of one individual? That is a question which the University authorities alone could properly answer?

X.

17th January 1895.

VIII.

WILL THE MEMORIALWALLAS EXPLAIN?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "NATIVE OPINION."

SIR,—The unconstitutional and hole-and-corner fashion, in which the Memorialwallas of Monday before last set to deliberate and promulgate their edicts, gave sufficient proof that they had not consulted the public in whose name they had contrived to get up a public memorial to Lord Harris, in the shape of a challenge-shield bearing his Lordships' name, perhaps, because, as the meditations of last Monday's gathering show, they were afraid to face the public. But have they consulted Lord Harris himself as to whether the form of the memorial, viz. a challenge-shield would at all meet with his approval and acceptance? For, as it transpires, and as the sporting world knows, it was not long ago that H. E. Lord Harris had declared himself against the very idea of a challenge shield—nay, so emphatic was his protest against it *on principle*, that he is said to have even threatened to sever his connexion with the local Athletic Association, should it have persisted in furthering the idea of a challenge shield! How can, then, Lord Harris be at all expected to allow his name to be associated with anything he hated *on principle*? It is said by some of the Memorialwallas that His Excellency does (perhaps would?) not mind it, as he is no more to be in the land in which the shield is to remain. But this is hardly credible, for it would mean an incredible surrender of principles—just to please one's gushing friends and accept their offering.

24th January 1895.

K. N. B.

IX.

A WORD TO THE FRIENDS AND ADMIRERS OF LORD HARRIS.

THE provisional Committee appointed at the Chamber of Commerce, a few days ago, have invited the friends and admirers of the retiring Governor, to meet at the Town Hall, day after to-morrow, to settle the steps to be taken to erect a fitting memorial. It is to be seen who and how many respond to the call. One portion of their work they have done energetically. They have collected a good sum and they hope to get more. There are many pliant dispositions in the presidency amongst the Chiefs, and Shettias-men who cannot refuse calls upon their purses for honouring departing Governors and other high officials, and who cannot, or for some selfish object, will not exercise their discretion in the matter. Past experience of them amply bears us out in what we are saying. The position of the Chiefs is explicable. But of the Shettias it is not so; and it is curious that they do not show themselves to be discreet. They erected a statue of Sir R. Temple and they will do the same or something else, for Lord Harris. Of course, as we have said before, the friends and admirers of anybody are perfectly at liberty to do what they deem proper for their idol. Those who disapprove of their doings have no business to oppose the same. But they have every right to advise them. The people of this presidency, at least the citizens of Bombay, have never been slow to do public honour to their Governors when it has been deserved. The friends and admirers of Lord Harris will admit this. Will they tell us why the public is now keeping aloof from the movement? That the public is not prepared to support them, they know well enough; otherwise they would have invited its assistance. They have not dared to do so. Why? Because they know that the administration of their idol has not merited its approval. It is to be regretted that this should be so. But that is what it is. The public is always ready to give credit where it is due. Lord Harris has done a good deal to encourage physical education and that is gratefully acknowledged. But what other material service has he done? What boon has he conferred upon the people under his charge for five years? Will his friends and admirers tell us that? We hope they will do it, day after to-morrow. Lord Harris is frank. That is creditable to him. But of what use is that estimable quality to the people if it does them no tangible good? We would ask his friends and

admirers some questions and would be glad to receive satisfactory answers thereto. Has the new Councils Act been worked in a liberal spirit? Have the seats been properly distributed? Why have the Central Division and Sind been given no adequate representation? Why has a double representation been given to the European merchants? Has not Lord Harris checked free discussion in the Council. Has his Lordship done anything to alleviate the great hardships inflicted by the revision settlements? What has he done for Panwell, Alibag and Deogad? Have their piteous appeals been attended to? Has the forest department's oppression been reduced? What has been done for Alibag? Has he dealt with the riots in an equitable manner? Do they know what has been done at Yoola, at Wai, and at Poona? Was it in keeping with his august position to abuse the people of Maharashtra in the way he has done at Sholapur and Ahmednagar? What for the quarrel with the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha? Why has advantage been taken of an insignificant slip in the language of the memorial? Was the Sabha ever questioned in this manner before, during its existence for thirty years? Why are the dying embers being fanned into flames by Government appeals against the acquittals in the Poona cases? Has the simultaneous examinations' question been sympathetically reported upon? Has an equitable scheme been framed for the new Provincial Service? Have not a number of Municipalities been abolished for their inability to bear the burden of primary education, unjustly saddled upon them? We can put a number of other queries, but think it unnecessary to do so. It will be sufficient if the above are satisfactorily answered at the meeting. Lord Harris, however well-intentioned and frank he may be, has been, in short, a weak Governor and has allowed himself to be guided by the bureaucracy. His administration has not been marked by liberal principles. True, he has appointed R. B. Ranade to the High Court Bench; the late Mr. Telang and Dr. Bhandarkar to the Vice-Chancellorship; and Mr. L. G. Deshmukh to a Collectorship. He may have done several other small services, but they are not such as to entitle him to any big memorial. His friends and admirers, whoever they may be, ought to have some regard for the good of the public; and that they do not seem to have. The acknowledged leaders of the people like the Hon'ble Mr. Yajnik, the Hon'ble Mr. Sayani, Mr. Budrudin Tyabji, and others have not joined the movement, and Lord Harris ought to be above accepting an honor which has not the approval of the people who have been under his charge for five years. He is frank and, therefore, we are sure, he will excuse frankness in others. And while going to press we learn that some of the European managers are going to close their mills on

the 29th instant in order to give the memorial meeting the aspect of a public meeting. We disapprove of these tactics which we think ought not to be resorted to in defiance of public opinion.

27th January 1895.

X.

A MEMORIAL MEETING IN POONA.

The rank and file of the Memorialwallas is not confined to Bombay alone; they seem to have their head-quarters in Poona also. Baffled in evoking people's sympathy here for a losing cause, they seem to have hit upon a plan of having the whole of the Dekkan on their side. And Poona gentlemen were not wanting in putting their shoulders to this hopeless and helpless memorial wheel, and a hole and corner meeting was called to order. Of the speakers, who only show the white side of their idol, there were some who forgetful however of the Poona riots and their genesis, considered the presidential administration for the last five years as efficient, and in appealing to those present for subscriptions their high appreciation of Lord Harris' encouragement to physical education they held out as an inducement. According to a telegram in the dailies, the meeting was composed of representative men from every section of society; but this delusion of the meeting being a public one, a telegram to us from our special correspondent, and which we publish elsewhere, completely dissipates. He says, "It has been ascertained from those invited and who attended the meeting that the invitation was by private circular and of these about fifteen gentlemen especially invited attended." But what business had Rao Bahadur Vishnoo Moreswar Bhide to attend the meeting? As President of the Sarvajanik Sabha Mr. Bhide has no business to be there, at any rate his presence there was a contravention of his position as an office-bearer. The same may be said of those present. We are glad the meeting was not a people's meeting; of course friends and admirers have a right to offer any amount of incense and *puja* to their idol, but surely a self-elected body of men have no right to represent a people. These ought to confine their movements to their camp, and do nothing in the name of the people who in general are not willing to subscribe to the same.

27th January 1895.

XI.

HARRIS MEMORIAL MEETING.

Lord Harris' *friends* and *admirers* have spoken out at last. Their hearts were surging with overpowering feelings of gratitude and admiration for His Excellency the Governor, or rather Their Excellencies the Governor and his consort for weeks past, and they were impatiently awaiting an opportunity to unburthen their bosoms. They, we mean these *friends* and *admirers* of Lord Harris, congregated in a body in the Town Hall Tuesday evening last,² with re-inforcements from very unusual quarters and with all the pomp and paraphernalia of a packed meeting. The movement, which culminated in yesterday's meeting, has a history of its own. About a month or two ago some wag in the press suggested the idea of a Harris memorial, probably never expecting that his grim suggestion would ever be put into a practical shape. But the person, who first started the idea, counted without his host. He forgot that there were some loyal citizens amongst us who have very little sense of humour and who would be *friends* and *admirers* of every passing authority. There are invertebrates and pachydermata in the Municipal Hall as well as outside, and it was not to be supposed that they would care a pin's head for public opinion, when once they are bent upon doing a thing. So the idea caught on. People, who flock to the Bunder to give valedictory addresses to the wife of a Municipal Commissioner, and whose great ambition in life is to figure in the papers as much as possible, would not of course let go such a splendid opportunity of advertizing themselves. They set themselves to the task right earnestly and devoted their time and energies, of which they had plenty to spare, to the realization of their great object, namely a statue to Lord Harris. They wanted to surprise the public one day with a grand public memorial meeting, after the whole wire-pulling was finished behind the curtain, but unfortunately some one babbled and the local Native Press got scent of their secret operations. The storm that was to overwhelm our city was foreshadowed by some indistinct cloud mutterings and lightning flashes in the shape of rumours about begging circulars and subscription lists, rumours which were contradicted the next day by the Anglo-Indian dailies, but which have proved too true in the end. All this game was played of course to throw the public off the scent, and it succeeded, we must admit, to some extent. Fresh rumours and their contradictions followed one another so rapidly, that there was utter confusion and bewilderment in the public mind for a

time, and one could not know whether Lord Harris was to have a statue after all. This was the incubation period of the gigantic movement. Then came the second act of the comedy with the Harris entertainment meeting at K. B. Murzban's house, where a dozen or two gentlemen resolved upon giving a *public* entertainment to His Excellency for his encouragement of physical exercise. People then thought wrongly as it now seems that that was the sole outcome of the big memorial movement, and reconciled themselves to the entertainment proposal in the belief that the statue had dwindled down to a shield and the impending storm had at last melted into a slight drizzling only. But people were deceived this time too. The *friends* and *admirers* of Lord Harris were good tacticians if nothing better, and elated by this seemingly cheap success they soon cast off the mask and appeared before the public with their long designed project. A notice was issued signed by several gentlemen, well-known for their readiness to lend their names for any movement simply to oblige a friend, and thus the long talked of memorial meeting was fixed for Tuesday the 29th. It was, however, to be a meeting of *friends* and *admirers* only, for the promoters were still not sure of their ground and they were anxious to steer clear of opposition. Thus began the third act of the comedy which however failed to evoke any interest or enthusiasm in the public, and the promoters had fears up to the last moment about the success of the meeting. As it was to be a meeting of *friends* and *admirers* only, the public looked upon it with utter indifference if not also with some compassionate indulgence for the vanity of the statue loving party. Those who had not the privilege to belong to the small class of *friends* and *admirers* of His Excellency did not trouble their heads about the affair, not at all dreaming of the surprise that was in store for them. The promoters, on the other hand, were working manfully night and day. Not being sure of a sufficient audience to fill even half the Town Hall, they hit upon some curious expedients which were but too evident in this composition of the crowd that gathered in the Town Hall on Tuesday to witness the performance of the Harris Memorial comedy. One of the signatories happened to be a mill-owner and he drafted a large body of his employees to adorn a number of chairs in the Hall in their gala-day costumes. It was indeed a wonderful spectacle, these mill-hands of Bombay who only a year and a half ago were abused and sent to jail by Lord Harris' Government for being rioters and *bedmashes*, becoming so enthusiastic *admirers* of His Excellency. But their excuse lies in their utter ignorance of the purpose for which they were brought. Another re-inforcement came from the *Marwarces* and petty shop-keepers in the Bazaar; not one of whom un-

derstood a word of English. Some of these also appear to have been carefully drilled in the art of clapping hands as soon as a signal was given and the frequent cheering which figures so prominently in the reports of the English dailies seemed to have been invariably commenced by persons in the left hand corner and sometimes even by men on the platform. This paid clapping was, however, done admirably and we have no hesitation in saying that those who organized it would attain great distinction as theatrical managers. Notwithstanding these occasional interruptions the audience seemed on the whole quite apathetic and most of them did not know what was being said by the speakers on the platform. These mute spectators and performers were soon tired of the uninteresting game they were made to play, and the rapid exodus out of the Hall, which began before Mr. Cotton's speech was half done, showed unmistakably that a large portion of the crowd was composed of any thing but voluntary admirers of Lord Harris. The crowd was also swelled by detachments from V.T. Institute students who, it is said, had been specially asked by their Principal to attend the meeting, and also clerks in the Municipal and other offices under the control of the promoters. But we forgot to mention one prominent section of the audience, namely, that occupying the platform. It was a large body, high up in society, abounding in wealth, distinguished for liberality, well-known in fact for everything but intelligence, discrimination or independence of character. Government officials, European merchants, Parsee *shetias* and Mahomedan traders with a sprinkling of learning here and there made up the assemblage which was gathered on the Town Hall platform to raise a statue to Lord Harris. Most of them were probably brought by personal solicitation or by self-advertizing impulse, and seemed half amazed at finding themselves among such a motley crowd. Add to this a large body of curious spectators, Hindus as well as Parsees, who went there to witness the grand performance of this memorial farce. Such was the composition of the meeting which the *Bombay Gazette* is pleased to certify as having a thoroughly representative character, and as being one of the most enthusiastic demonstrations regarding the worth of a departing Governor. It would perhaps be more appropriate to call it a demonstration of the stupidity and servility that largely prevails in the wealthy portion of the native communities. There were several other features of the meeting which could not have failed to strike an eye-witness. Most of the familiar faces, that are usually met with at public meetings were conspicuous by their absence, while the Hindu community with a few significant exceptions may be said to be practically unrepresented. We do not know whom Dr. Bhandarkar represents, but it is sheer absurdity to call

Mr. Ghelabhai or Mr. D. D. Adhikari representative Hindus. No body, we presume, heard of the last named gentleman before he was accidentally caught hold of by the promoters of the meeting, while as to Dr. Bhandarkar the less said the better. He was personally honoured by Lord Harris, and it is charitable to suppose that in siding with the memorial movement he was only discharging a debt of gratitude. The same might be said of the other great communities of Bombay which could only be said to have been represented if the dullest portion of any community be in any sense the representative portion. Let there be no misconceptions about the character of this bogus movement. That the meeting was of a few *friends* and *admirers* of Lord Harris no one will care to gainsay. Everybody in the world has his friends and admirers, and no one need object if they choose to raise a statue to the object of their admiration. That Tuesday's was not a *public* meeting will be admitted on all hands, and some of the speakers such as Dr. Bhandarkar went even further in declaring that a public memorial in the case of Lord Harris was not possible. We admire Dr. Bhandarkar's candour, whatever be the reasons he gave for the fact. There was a similar view of justification and palliation in the speeches of other speakers. There was in fact too much protesting and excusing in the various laudatory addresses, and even the worst enemy of Lord Harris could not have dreamt before that His Excellency required so much defence. To the praise of His Lordship, there was no bound. Speaker after speaker vied with one another in smothering Lord Harris and his wife with all sorts of superlatives and hyperboles, so much so that one is even tempted to suspect that some of them at least were designedly ironical. Lord Harris was impartiality, says one; he was very straight-forward, says another. Lord Harris was 'dignity incarnate' says Dr. Bhandarkar; and so on. Lord Harris in fact is the *beau ideal* of a Governor. Nothing more of course was wanted, but these hards of their Excellencies probably forgot there is something like overdoing one's part. With the various points touched by the speakers we have nothing to do at present. There have been worse Governors of this Presidency who had their statues, and we do not grudge one to Lord Harris also if his *friends* and *admirers* have got superfluous money to waste upon such things. On the contrary we would even go so far as to suggest that as Tuesday's meeting sang the praises of Lady Harris as well as Lord Harris a statue will also be erected to her Ladyship commemorating the important fact that she was the wife of a Governor; and if money can be spared we would like to see the whole Harris family engraved in marble! There is another suggestion we should also like to make

to the worthy people who organized Tuesday's meeting. It is now clear that every Governor, good, bad or indifferent must have a statue ; but Sir James Fergusson is probably the only living person who, though once a Governor, did not get a statue. He is shortly expected here and we hope advantage will be taken of his visit by the usual *friends and admirers* of exalted mediocrities to raise a statue for him also ? Now that statue-making is fast being reduced to one of the commonest acts of courtesy to a departing Governor, nobody need bother himself about it. We only wish that a time may not come when the absence of a statue will be the highest mark of respect and appreciation for a Governor.

31st January 1895

XII.

A DEPUTATION TO LORD HARRIS.

His Excellency received a deputation of his friends and admirers at the Secretariat, and in accepting the resolutions passed at the Town Hall meeting, Lord Harris made a short speech. In one place His Excellency observes:—" And let me add this, gentlemen, that I leave Bombay with a most undying affection for its natural feature, *and regard and respect for the people of every race* within its boundaries of an absolutely unqualified description." The italics are ours; we do sincerely hope that His Excellency has regard and respect for the people of *every* race. A reference however, to his Ahmednagar speech will disclose to any one what his feelings then were about the Hindus in general and Brahmans in particular. Did His Excellency give any or the least attention to the memorial of the thirteen Wai Brahmans, who according to that memorial were so grossly ill-treated ? But these are old scores and we shall not rake them up. If His Excellency has now changed his opinion, that is the result perhaps of further evidence of the innocence of the Hindus. But had His Excellency spent some time in sifting the papers on religious disputes and finding out the truth, he could have found reasons to change his opinion then just as he seems to do now. However His Excellency deserves to be thanked for having found grounds at last to form a good opinion of *every* people within the four boundaries of the Presidency. That is no small change in His Excellency—though too late wrought to be of any real use, or gain to those who were the particular objects of contempt and hatred in the eyes of His Excellency or of

those who formed his eyes, and who are therefore as much to be congratulated upon it, if they care to be congratulated, as His Excellency deserves to be thanked for the same.

3rd February 1895.

XIII.

THE LAST SOCIAL DOINGS OF THE RETIRING GOVERNOR.

(One of the last social functions of the retiring Governor is an entertainment to Sir James Fergusson at the Government house. Certainly as an ex-Governor of Bombay, and one who has had much to do with the local Corporation, Sir James may feel much delighted to meet the members of the local Corporation. In inviting that body Lord Harris did show tact which may to some extent smooth down the angularities between the Corporation and the Executive Government on questions of the Police increase and several other questions. Indeed the Municipality was done a grave wrong and there were convincing proofs that the attitude taken up by Government was any thing but just and equitable. But by-gones are by-gones, and in the invitation and its acceptance both have shown a spirit of cordiality and good taste rarely observable in their official relations. But one thing is probably certain ; though conservative, Lord Harris, after his five years' administration, must see that intellectually, morally and socially this Presidency is far advanced and required to be governed under rules other than those which he had obtained for his model.

THE KAISER-I-HIND.

(ANGLO-VERNACULAR.)

I.

For some weeks past rumours are rife that certain honourable members and a European merchant between them have been stealthily going the round of wealthy members of the native community with a subscription list the object of which is to obtain funds for the statue of Lord Harris whose term of office is approaching to an end. It seems these rumours have travelled far and wide. Even a Calcutta paper, no other than the well-informed *Amrita Bazaar Patrika*, refers to it. Whether the rumour is correct or not, it matters little. We all know the stale game of hole and corner subscriptions which are afterwards ratified by so-called "public meeting" which eventually turns out to be a meeting of "friends and admirers." So that if the rumour eventually turn out to be true, we should not be at all surprised at it. But such subscriptions and such a "public meeting" will not have the sanction of the independent native community of the Presidency. Their feeling as to the general value of Lord Harris's administration is well known. It is against him, as that of an administrator who has not only failed to rule but has besides alienated the sympathy of the people. Meanwhile the below quoted remarks of the *Amrita Bazaar Patrika* will, we dare say, be perused with interest and instruction :—

Says our contemporary "let Lord Harris have his statue, but let the people stand aloof from the movement. Then alone will his statue be rated at his true worth. * * And when Lord Harris is gone, the people will point at the statue and remark :

"Here is the image of one who came to rule us and whose duty it was to govern us well. His record of service was, however, quite blank and he, therefore, failed to carry the good wishes of the people with him. The only reward he got was this statue which cost the country a few thousand pounds ; but not a farthing of the amount was paid voluntarily by a single Indian. His reward was only a few thousand pounds, which even he would not have got, if many of those who contributed to the fund, were left free."

· 11th November 1894.

II.

JOCKEYING NATIVE CHIEFS FOR SUBSCRIPTIONS IN HONOUR OF LORD HARRIS !

APPEALS for funds to Native Princes and Chiefs for commemorating the services of exalted mediocrities who may temporarily rule the country or a province, irrespective of the intrinsic value of such services, are now becoming a regular practice, though the obvious impropriety of such need hardly be gainsaid. *Spontaneous* subscriptions to cherish the memory of a really deserving administrator of genuine sympathy and sterling statesmanship, are one thing, and secret, hole and corner appeals by means of circulars by private individuals who may happen to be *persona grata* with the authority to be so honoured or commemorated, are another thing. There is nothing improper in the former case. For the administrator who has really promoted the welfare of the people over whom he may have ruled and endeared himself to them by his deep and abiding sympathy is one whom all classes of the community are eager to honour by means of a permanent memorial. But there can be no spontaneity, no desire whatever to perpetuate the memory of one whom popular voice may have pronounced not only a dismal failure but something worse—an administrator out of touch with popular feelings and sentiments, with no genuine sympathy to speak of, and above all one who by public acts and public utterances may have done his utmost to exasperate the people and bring on himself their burning indignation. Thus, when such an administrator retires, it is simply a blind for the *persona grata* to manufacture circulars and send them round first to the tongue-tied and dumb-driven Chiefs and appeal to them for funds under the hollow pretence of “general desire.” It is a blind to obviate the scandal of what is called “official pressure.” It is simply jockeying Native Chiefs to raise the wind !

Something of this character seems to have been initiated in connexion with the approaching retirement of the present Governor of Bombay. A private circular, was sometime ago addressed to the divers Chiefs of Kattyawar and elsewhere by two private gentlemen, namely, the Hon'ble Mr. Nowroji Nusservanji Wadia and Mr. Beaufort. They are both known to the commercial and industrial community of Bombay. But we have yet to learn what their rela-

tions are with the Native Chiefs to warrant them in putting themselves forward and appealing to them for subscriptions to perpetuate the memory of Lord Harris? It would indeed be interesting to hear from their lips their own credentials to address the chiefs in the manner they have done. If not for any other purpose, at any rate for the purpose of inspiring confidence in their *bonafides*, it is imperative that they should justify their action in taking the lead. Had it been a joint letter by all the Dewans, it might have been a different thing. But what are Messrs. Wadia and Beaufort to the Native Chiefs or the Native Chiefs to them? Really, it looks exceedingly suspicious why *these gentlemen above all* should have put themselves forward as the promoters of the movement? Are we to presume that the chiefs would consider their action as purely *nonofficial* and *voluntary*. If so the chiefs have been misled.

It will be seen that the circular is in every way highly objectionable and unjustifiable. In the first place, it has not even the merit of being well worded. We have seldom come across a more slipshod piece of composition. Here is a specimen. In the second paragraph it is stated that His Lordship's "straightforward and manly intercourse has struck all those whose privilege it has been to come across him." Will the promoters be so good as to explain what they mean by "intercourse" here. "Straightforward and manly intercourse"? With whom?

But let that pass. What we ask is, whether the statement made in the third paragraph is correct. *Is it true* that there is "a general desire on the part of the various communities to testify to the high and sincere esteem in which His Excellency is held"? How did the signatories ascertain that there is a general desire? Did they consult the many representative men of the various communities? Or did they cause a plebiscite to be taken for the purpose? Or did they come to the conclusion from the opinions pronounced in the press? We know, as a matter of fact, that they have done neither the first nor the second thing. And as to the opinions of the press, we at least are not aware that, as exponent of the "various communities," it has expressed itself in favour of having any permanent memorial of His Lordship. On the contrary, leading journals have been most pronounced in their general condemnation of Lord Harris as Governor of Bombay. His administration has been declared a failure; and the recent utterances of His Lordship in the matter of the Deccan riots have, as it were, sealed that condemnation. How under the circumstances can the various communities have any desire to perpetuate the memory of a Governor who excited angry feel-

ings and much bad blood when everything to the contrary was expected from his high position. His "impartiality" has been openly criticised. We make bold to say that we are blurring out the naked truth when we observe that if an honest and independent plebiscite were taken it would be found that the verdict of the people of this Presidency would be *dead* against the sort of movement which the two gentlemen set on foot in a hole and corner fashion some weeks ago. Is it not then most objectionable on their part to have issued the circular? It is tantamount to obtaining subscriptions by misrepresentations. But the ethics of the paragraph speak for themselves and it is superfluous to comment on them.

Let us now go to the 5th paragraph. Mark, reader the jesuitism implied in the words. "If as is expected." What do they signify? Are we not justified in inferring that the promoters, *as a matter of course, expected* that the chiefs will respond to the appeal. It was obviously a polite invitation to them to give their reply in the affirmative.

Now we come to that part of the paragraph in which it is stated that "a public meeting will hereafter be held, that is, *after* the chiefs have, *as expected*, subscribed handsomely to the fund! The question is, why *after* and not before? One should have thought that in a matter of the kind *the only honourable and straightforward course* would have been *not* to appeal to the chiefs *before* the "various communities" in public meeting assembled, had expressed their "general desire," in no uncertain tones that the services of Lord Harris to the people of the Presidency were of such a nature as to deserve a permanent memorial! But the inverse procedure already adopted is a clear indication of the utter kollowness of the "general desire" under the cover of which the two gentlemen have absurdly sought to get subscriptions first. We need hardly say that under such a method any person can get for himself a statue! He has only to rely on two friends to issue secret appeals and get the *persona grata* to subscribe, and afterwards give the affair a *public* character! But the public are not a flock of geese to be deceived by such crooked methods of raising the wind and erecting statues. Moreover, it is a question where is the line of discrimination to be drawn when good, bad, and indifferent administrators alike are to have statues or other marks of permanent memorials to themselves!

This is the way the friends and admirers of Lord Harris go about inviting circulars to Native Chiefs, jockeying them for fat subscriptions, and then inviting the public to join on the humbug plea of "general

desire." We need scarcely observe that such memorials are utterly unworthy of those who start, and still more unworthy of the persons in whose honour they may be raised. They are twice discredited. They discredit those who raise them and they discredit those in whose honour they are raised. It is time that such bogus memorials were once for all exposed; and nothing could be better for our people than at this juncture to meet together in the public and denounce the attempt that has been made to palm off on the Presidency of Bombay memorial in the so-called honour of the departing Governor. * * *

25th November 1894.

III.

THE NEW GOVERNOR.

BOMBAY heaved a deep sigh of relief on Thursday last. She was relieved to learn that the appointment of a new Governor, for which she was wistfully waiting for these many weeks, was made at last. There is not the least doubt that the Presidency is rejoiced at the change in its administrative chieftainship. She will now breathe with greater freedom. Her pulse will beat with greater regularity. Her heart will move in greater unison with the prospect of the change which was so sadly needed. The sullen anguish which seized it for months past will give place to sober satisfaction. The subdued and pent up indignation will be succeeded by a feeling of joyful expectancy. For, it is now admitted on all hands that Lord Harris has proved himself every inch all that a Governor should not be. The last year of his career as the head of the administration has been signalised by such a deplorable want of tact, judgment, and sympathy as to be deserving of the severest castigation of the most careful and impartial critic of his Lordship's career. His friends and admirers may rhapsodise as much as they like. They may ring poems in celebration of his approaching retirement. They may fill peppercorns of praise to their heart's content. They may Jerry-mander for subscriptions in his honour. They may jockey native Princes and Chiefs for the same purpose and destroy what little of the reputation that remains to the political agencies at the courts of these indigenous potentates. All these and other hollow attempts to apotheosise his Lordship will be in vain. They will not deceive the public who have seen through the sham farce which a few active busy bodies have been playing out of "regard and esteem" for him. But the verdict has already been

pronounced, that Lord Harris has been a dismal failure as Governor of Bombay, whatever else he may be. And we make bold to say that that verdict will be confirmed by posterity, despite what contemporary panegyrists may say. But there will be time yet to take an impartial survey of his Lordship's quinquennial administration and sum up the public judgment. Meanwhile let us say a word about Lord Sandhurst, the Governor-elect.

Born of parents who have left their distinctive marks of character, it may be reasonably presumed that Lord Sandhurst will realise the expectations formed of him. The Sir William Mansfield whom Bombay knew from 1860 to 1865 and whom all India knew from 1865 to 1870 was indeed one of the ablest specimens of that type of military officer who have been called soldier-statesmen. He had been Consul General at Warsaw and held a subordinate ambassadorial post at Constantinople before the Crimean War. The dark events of 1857 brought him to India where his military capacity was once more emphasised as it was during the Russian war. He served under Sir Hugh Rose and when that officer became Commander-in-Chief of India Sir William succeeded him in the Bombay command. As a military reformer Bombay owes a great deal to him. It was he who first directed the pulling down of the old Portuguese ramparts built about two centuries ago and laid down the plan of the future defences of Bombay. But not only did he shine in the camp. He was equally a brilliant light in the Council and shed no mean lustre in the Executive and Legislative Councils of Bombay under the Presidency of the distinguished Sir Bartle Frere. It was in the height of the speculative fever which seized Bombay in 1864 that Sir William Mansfield first wrote his brochure on the adoption of a gold currency. He lived to see his great economic reform passed by the Government of India. Gold sovereigns and mohurs were actually struck, but owing to the unfortunate commercial and monetary disasters which overtook Bombay and shook confidence all over the country, no fair and lengthened trial was given to the scheme which therefore died a natural death at the time. But the events which have occurred since 1876 demonstrated the farsightedness and genuine statesmanship of that great soldier. Perhaps, there have been few debaters and minute writers of the cleverness, logical acumen, and grace of style and finish of Sir William Mansfield. As Commander-in-Chief of India during the Viceroyalty of Sir John Lawrence he was known for his military economies and stern discipline. The Jervis case gave ample proofs of it. As an officer and a gentleman Capt. Jervis mis-

managed the household affairs of His Excellency and brought on himself a court martial which cashiered him. The Commander-in-Chief suffered no little odium on this account, but all right minded persons vindicated his high sense of duty. A colleague of Sir John Lawrence, he was a staunch opponent of the second Afghan war and his minute on the conquest of Afghanistan, as a counterblast to that of Sir H. Rawlinson, may still be read with profit in the Blue-books on Central Asia. Such was Sir William Mansfield before he was raised to the peerage as Lord Sandhurst—a man of great force of character and stern unbending justice. It is to be hoped that these lineaments of the father have descended in the son. From the mother's side, too, the Governor-elect gives us expectations of a hopeful character. A staunch, liberal minded woman, with a will of her own, she was no unknown figure a few short years ago at the London school-board. She also offered herself for the London County Council election but was debarred from sitting at its board on account of the statute. If we mistake not she helped Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji at Central Finsbury, along with Mrs. Evans Bell and other good ladies. Thus Lord Sandhurst comes of a stock at once healthy and robust in mind. A Gladstonian to the backbone in politics, there is every reason to believe he will not belie his liberal instincts and sympathies in the administration of this Presidency. It would, of course, be premature to forecast anything. For it has not infrequently occurred that men coming with fair credentials, entirely fail to realise the expectations formed of them. They are beset with surroundings which are seldom healthy. At the best the men on whose advice they lean are cribbed, cabined, and confined—politically and otherwise. Holding themselves aloof from the people and relying entirely on their own infallibility such counsellors have not only marred public interests but marred the reputation of well meaning Governors also. If we are not much mistaken that has been the sad fate of the retiring Governor. Let us hope his successor may escape that fate. A great deal depends on himself. He can certainly avert the contingency if he has enough vigour of character to think and judge for himself rather than rely on the judgment of a bureaucracy strong in its own self sufficiency and omniscience and also in its antipathies and prejudices. A fair respect for public opinion and a deep and broad sympathy for the ruled are also essential. The lack of these made Lord Harris a failure as an administrator, and Lord Sandhurst would be wise if he steered clear of the fatal rocks on which his predecessor knowingly allowed himself to be wrecked. His Lordship will be most welcome at this critical juncture and it will all depend on himself how far he will endeavour to abridge the gulf existing

between the two great communities and attract the sympathy of the people at large towards him. If he can tolerably succeed in these directions we may anticipate for him a career of mutual confidence, respect and regard. Otherwise, we should not be surprised if it turn out to be the old tale of King Log replacing King Stork !!

16th December 1894.

IV.

PROPOSED MEMORIAL TO LORD HARRIS—SECOND ATTEMPT.

"The most painful incident in political criticism is when we are compelled to refuse to the memory of some deceased statesman that mood of fame and honour which his friends and followers demand. But if admiring coadjutors and disciples propose the canonisation of a false saint, the apotheosis of a false hero, it surely becomes one of the highest religious or social duties to deny the pretended achievements and to protest against the posthumous honours." These are the burning words of a high souled and righteous English official, now dead and gone. Perhaps, few names in India at this moment are cherished with love and affection as the name of Major Evans Bell of Mysore fame. The late Mr. Robert Knight derived not a little of his inspiration on the politics of British India, and specially of Native States, from him. The words quoted at the beginning of this article had reference to the canonisation of Lord Dalhousie. But we think the general reflection expressed therein will serve for all times and for all men—dead or living. Perhaps, at this juncture, when a clique of far from disinterested persons whose influence on the administration of the Presidency is absolutely nil and whom none recognise as public leaders in any sense of the term have been sedulously endeavouring to influence a certain class of what may be called the invertebrates of native society, it may not be amiss to recall the quotation, so apposite it is to the subject whom these ephemeral *poojaris* are going to offer a kind of artificial *pooja*. Six individuals self constituted have taken upon themselves the task of honouring Lord Harris by hook or by crook. The retiring Governor has been pronounced such a dismal failure as an administrator by the leading and independent Native Press that it is an open secret, he has felt the popular verdict. Whether it was directly or indirectly desired to get such a verdict modified in some way

we are not in a position to say, as we do not pretend, like the six spirits who have been for weeks working in *camera*, to be in the confidence of the exalted mediocrity! But judging from the method and manner adopted by these worthies, it is evident that they have taken upon themselves the impossible task of whitewashing his Lordship's administrative career. Two European merchants, one European official, one Mahomedan, one Hindu and one Parsi, whose combined political influence and knowledge of the administration of this Presidency may be considered as next to nothing, have girded their loins to get subscriptions for commemorating the services of the retiring Governor of Bombay. Having been completely unmasked in their efforts the two gentlemen who had issued that preposterous circular to the princes and chiefs of Kattyawar which was unearthed the other day felt themselves so humiliated that, in spite of it they were bound to see that their patron saint should not depart these shores without tomtom and bagpipes—unhonoured and unsung. No. That would be a calamity worse than death. They must retrieve their honour jeopardized by that preposterous circular. So bating not a jot, they lay in wait, just as the defeated lay in ambush to watch for their conqueror, to snatch a sort of a victory and wipe off, if possible, the old defeat. Thanks to the return of an able official strategist, who has a Mahomedan and a Hindu friend at his elbow, they seem to have taken heart of grace. With this fresh aid they have been able to renew their efforts, and that on a wider scale—a not insignificant proof of that complete rout they lately suffered. These adjuvating coadjutors have now formed themselves into a ring. Another first fruit is to be discerned in the active canvassing they have been carrying on for some days in different parts of the town for subscriptions. Perhaps the public have no idea of the hard begging and cringing process going all round. How the wavering and the flexible have been approached. How the inflexible have been plied into opening their purse strings by tissues of old women's yarns and fabulous legends. Were the individuals appealed to for subscriptions to relate their respective tales we are sure quite a thrilling volume of romance might be compiled for the future historian to moralise upon the ethics of contemporary society and contemporary politics. But let this pass. For the truth will never remain concealed. All that we may say here is this. That all the available imbecility of wealth, all the available parasites of rank, all the corrupt element of flunkedom, educated and uneducated, have been roped in and gathered in the large net of the gentlemen begging for subscriptions. These are now invited to meet in the hall of the Municipal Corporation on Tuesday next

to register the wishes of the stalwart six who have undertaken to apotheosise their "false hero." There will be time enough next week to criticise the proceedings in that place. But it is meet that we should take this opportunity to warn those who are not blind to the strategies which are now being actively carried on by the admiring band who, with *no* credentials to speak of in the name of the public, so far as the politics of the Bombay Presidency go—it is meet that they should hold themselves aloof from this *artificial* demonstration. Nay more. It should be their solemn duty—their highest religious and social duty—to give their emphatic denial to the pretended achievements of Lord Harris and enter their vigorous protest against the honour that is about to be paid to him but which he has not shown by any political act to deserve. Already the voice of the public of the Presidency has been pronounced against His Lordship through its recognised organs of opinion. It is superfluous to observe that it is decisive against the movement to which so much hollow eclat is being given. It is daily swelling in volume; and it would be simply impotent to pervert the judgment of History by such means as the few *persona grata* are taking at the present moment. The attempt must not only prove abortive but end in discredit to all concerned.

13th January 1895.

V.

So the nobodies who have thrust themselves on the notice of the public as somebodies in connexion with the bogus memorial movement, impressed into their services for last Tuesday's meeting at the rooms of the Chamber of Commerce such of the wealthy noodledom and flunkeydom as were available for their purpose! And they made themselves happy. Happy mortals! If they and the person to be *poojahed* consider that it is the acme of political bliss to be blessed with the benedictions of Bombay bumbledom, we wish them joy of it. They have been at ease like the boy which Pearse & Co. illustrate in their soap advertisements "He won't be happy until he has got it." People said that the "friends and admirers" of Lord Harris would not be happy till they by hook or by crook caught in their net all the *persona grata*, all the parasites, and all the clotting imbeciles they could *putrao*, including, of course, the few stolid princes and chiefs who finding themselves like the earthen pipkin, could not refuse compliance with the celebrated "manly intercourse" circular of October last!

20th January 1895

VI.

We strongly commend to the notice of the "friends and admirers" of Lord Harris the following refreshing criticism on their abortive attempt to cherish the administrative career of his Lordship—a career of perfect blank, made more dismal by his conduct and attitude towards the people at large during the last twelve months and upwards.

"To the mingled amazement and amusement of the people of Bombay the satirical suggestion that a statue should be erected to the memory of Lord Harris has been taken seriously and a small but energetic committee is collecting subscriptions for the purpose. It would seem that the scandal connected with Lord Lansdowne's statue—a scandal to which the attention of the House of Commons was rightly called—is about to be repeated. * * * It remains to be seen whether the people to whom the begging letter has been addressed will have the courage of their opinions. In any event, it is certain that no such appeal ought to have been made. Lord Harris will hardly derive much satisfaction from *a machine-made complement of the kind which some of the too zealous friends are endeavouring to pay him—out of other people's pockets.*"

One word more. It is rumoured in the bazaar that to give eclat to Tuesday's meeting, a large number of mill hands belonging to some of the memorial grinders are to be impressed into service? If this be true, it is quite transparent this latest artifice to give a *public* aspect to the bogus affair.

27th January 1895.

VII.

"BLATANT EXALTATION" OF EXALTED FAILURE!

1

"They praise and they admire they know not what
And know not whom, but as one leads the other:
And what delight to be by such extolled,
To live upon their tongues and be their talk,
Of whom to be dispraised were no small praise."

Not being in the confidence of that "exalted mediocrity," whose flatterers, for it would be incorrect to call them "admirers," fooled themselves to the top of their bent in the Town Hall on Tuesday last, we are

not in a position to say how that personage appreciated the pæans of praise that were so loudly sung in his departing honour. But judging from the extravagant rhetoric and the still more extravagant rhodomontade that was retailed *ad libitum* on that occasion, it may be truly said that, perhaps, never in the memory of the "oldest inhabitant" living was there enacted a more screaming farce, a booming burlesque, than that which was put upon the orchestra stage by that bold band of bouncing brothers who have been so extensively caricatured in the town for a week or two past in all manner of leaflets and squibs, not the least telling of which was the one appropriately baptised the "Day of the Departing Deity." To say that the combined performance of the several actors fell flat on the poor uneducated audience of impressed Marwaris, mill-clerks and petty market hawkers and dealers, who, gossip says, with what truth we do not know, were specially conveyed thither in thirty victorias, paid out, of course, from the "princely" funds already collected to add eclat to the occasion—to say that the combined performance fell flat is to say the grim truth, despite the hyperbolic legends of the over-crupulous claquers of the partisan Anglo-Indian Press! For, we put it to the critical public whether going over that sahara of speeches, sprinkled no doubt with an oasis here and there, they could find anything to warrant them in arriving at the conclusion that there was the slightest justification for that poor, we may say, miserable, exhibition in the Town Hall?

What did the speeches come to, when analysed? What did they come to in point of substance? The critic may search and search in vain for a single fact of Lord Harris's five years' administration to find one good satisfactory reason for raising a permanent memorial to him! On the contrary, there are so many false points of praise that we may justly consider them as wholly suspicious. It does not seem to have occurred to any one of the prominent speakers that "too much magnifying of a man," as Lord Bacon shrewdly observes, "doth irritate contradiction and procure envy and scorn." As far as ourselves are concerned we do not envy those speakers. But we cannot refrain from expressing our scorn at their absurd utterances, for they overshot their mark and brought the subject of their unmitigated adulation into discredit. For instance, we publicly challenge Mr. Cotton to justify the following magniloquent statement in which he indulged without rhyme or reason. "To those who have followed his career since he came to rule over us, I am

sure there will be unanimity in recognising that without fear or favour His Excellency has zealously kept to the straight path of duty, and with cautious yet firm footsteps has always moved onwards towards solid progress and increased light while extending the right hand of sympathy and encouragement to those willing to grasp it." We lay the flattering unction to our soul that, perhaps more than a handful of persons in Bombay, we have closely watched the course of Lord Harris's administration since he came to rule over us. It is no idle boast. It is no "conceit" of the kind in which certain extremely self-loving journalists constantly indulge to their hearts' content. The columns of this journal amply vindicate our statement. Now, does Mr. Cotton mean to asseverate categorically, as a sort of universal proposition, that among such critics of His Lordship "there will be unanimity in recognising" that His Excellency has administered the Presidency without fear or favour, with impartiality and sympathy? If he does, we cannot but think that, perhaps, in the whole Presidency, Mr. Cotton was the last person qualified to speak in the way he did. It argues that he is blissfully, or on purpose, ignorant of what has been said by the entire Vernacular and Anglo-Vernacular Press touching His Lordship's administration. Not to go too far, the comments which have appeared in that Press during the last four months alone are more than ample to prove to demonstration that, if there is unanimity at all, it is the unanimity of an opposite kind—the unanimity of opinion that Lord Harris has *not* ruled without fear or favour, that he has *not* zealously kept to the straight path of duty, and that he has egregiously failed in his sympathy towards the ruled. The scandalous jobs in connexion with certain judicial and magisterial appointments are still fresh in the memory of Bombay. These showed how far His Excellency was moved by the strictest sense of justice and impartiality towards those who richly deserved it. Then, again, where was the straight and stern path of duty in connexion with the Rajabai Tower Tragedy, with the riots in Bombay, in Wai, and in Poona? Where was it in connexion with the infamous Mowra Bill against which there was the unanimous voice of the Presidency, aye, even of the partisan press on whom, His Lordship openly declared, he relied for light and guidance. Was it again in connexion with the distribution of seats under the New Council's Act? If he had adhered to the straight path of duty Lord Harris would not have brought down such deserving odium on himself as the one that overtook him about two years ago. Was it, again, we ask, in connexion with the proceedings in the Legislative Council where he was not slow to give many evasive replies, and where he set a most objectionable and demoralising example to his colleagues in Council of

making them burke straightforward replies to important questions affecting the weal and woe of the Presidency? Was it, again, in connexion with the closure he arbitrarily applied to the criticisms of some of the nonofficial members? Was that prompted by duty or by a narrow and illiberal spirit to stifle representative public opinion which strove to make itself heard in the Council of the Province? And as to sympathy, has Mr. Cotton been living in Bombay or Kamaschatka! If the former, he ought to know, and, we dare say, he *does* know, that no ruler has made himself more odious by his antipathy to the people at large than Lord Harris. That antipathy reached its culmination during the events which followed the Poona riots. Was it an instance of that sympathy of which Mr. Cotton speaks, to have roundly rated, if not abused, the people of Ahmednuggur and Sholapur, without cause or provocation? In short, in what phases of his public career, we challenge Mr. Cotton to point out to us, has Lord Harris evinced his true sympathy with the people? Is it in the matter of salt or forests or abkari, or the tyrannous enhancements of land revenue in certain places not far from the city?

Is it possible under such circumstances that posterity will ever endorse the verdict which Mr. Cotton fondly entertains—namely, that “subsequent events will show a broader and juster view of his administration”? Well may he wait till Doomsday for that cherished consummation. And yet he had the audacity to talk of Lord Harris leaving an indelible mark on the moral and material history of this Presidency! Why, the moral and material condition, as depicted in the roseate annual Administration Reports published during His Excellency’s regime, is proof positive of the very opposite, if only Mr. Cotton, who presumes to have watched his administration, had ever cared to dive deep into its voluminous pages. Then, he is spoken of as a “hard-working” administrator. They say the workman is known by his labours. But we have failed to discern in any public act of His Lordship the stamp of that hard work to which Mr. Cotton refers. Bombay well knows that His Excellency was always at hard work on the cricket field at Gunesh Khind or Mahabaleshwar or Bombay. She knows to her bitter experience that when the riots broke out His Lordship refused to leave his cricket ground and come down to Bombay. No, acting on the advice of some friends, unaware of the real conditions of the city, he regaled himself at Gunesh Khind till the occasion of a cricket game, five days afterwards, brought him to Bombay to take an hour’s drive through those streets which were the scenes of anarchy and bloodshed? We also know that his Lordship had hard work when visiting the Princes of Kattyawar, receiving their unctu-

ous flattery, and their generous hospitality—hospitality which was put to the severest test in that “manly intercourse” circular, put into circulation by two busy bodies, whom it is needless to name,—a circular which has showered into the laps of the eight illustrious Secretaries the large sum, which was so magniloquently referred to on Tuesday last !

Mr. Cotton further talks of His Excellency’s intimate acquaintance with the requirements of the *mfussil* people and of district administration. If so, where are the proofs ? He has failed to give even *one* marked instance where, having known the people’s requirement, he did his best, with the means and power at his disposal, to meet them ? Or shall we take a plebiscite, uninfluenced by official pressure, and ask the *mfussil* people to verify the experience of Mr. Cotton ?

Later on, Mr. Cotton indulges in another of his fine frenzied legends touching his Lordship’s decisive and prompt action in preventing serious complications and his “wise and conciliatory speech.” Are we living in the land of reality or romance ? Is it the same “common sense” speech to which he refers ? If so, Mr. Cotton for the nonce must have taken leave of common sense to have indulged in that fallacious rhapsody. But it will be tedious to analyse and contradict every statement of this principal speaker and admirer of Lord Harris.

If however, Mr. Cotton was legendary, Mr. Fazulbhoy Visram was even something more. He was legendary and romantic. He talked of a “large and influential gathering” representing “the wealth and education of Bombay.” This was nothing but pure fiction as those unbiassed spectators who were in the Town Hall could verify and as *Native Opinion* has ably pointed out in its columns of Thursday last. No doubt a kind of the representatives of education were there—some of the educated flunkeydom of the city who have been grateful for the crumb of patronage thrown at them were no doubt there. But our new-fledged C. I. E. and whilom Imperial Councillor—himself quite a paragon of the wealth and intelligence of the city—observed that “in future it will be better if we get a few more Governors—and Governors-General for the matter, like Lord Harris !” For then the millennium will be ushered in, and Bombay will be nothing but a city entirely composed of “parasites,” “sycophants” “flunkeys” and goodness knows what besides. Each man will be a C. I. E. or a J. P. or a Fellow, just as they say every third man belonged to the order of the Legion of Honour in France during the heyday of the demoralised Second Empire. Of such miserable and legendary stuff were the speeches. We turn from them in utter disgust, though, if we

wished, we could go on criticising them to double the length that this article has reached.

We have searched, we repeat, and searched in vain, for a single, "sober" statement regarding any important public act of Lord Harris which would justify the memorialists in perpetuating his memory. To us it seems that those well-known lines of the great English dramatist in *Julius Cæsar* may be fittingly applied to these ecstatic address grinders:—

"Ever note, Lucilius

When love begins to sicken and decay
It useth an enforced ceremony
There are no tricks in plain and single faith
But hollow men, like horses hot at hand,
Make gallant show and promise of their mettle;
But when they should endure the bloody spur
They fall their crests and, like deceitful jades,
Sink in the trial."

Thus have these audacious admirers and flatterers sunk low in our estimation after the trial they gave us of their true mettle at the Town Hall. We expected to hear great things being said of the departing Governor to perpetuate his name. But we found that like the deceitful jades, their crests had fallen and they had nothing glorious to achieve. To such a fate have Lord Harris's friends reduced him. Well may he cry "save me from such friends." For in his heart of hearts, he must have painfully realised the truthfulness of that homely French phrase—"beaucoup de bruit, peu de fruit" "much noise, little fruit." Let his Lordship, if he chooses, further remember that vain glory is after all "the idol of the parasite and the admiration of the fool!" He may seek to leave a great name behind him, but he has showed no signs of greatness. As Bacon says: "He that seeketh to be eminent among *able* men, hath a great task, but that is ever good for the public, but he that plots to be the only figure among ciphers is the decay of a whole age." Thus the "blatant exaltation" of this exalted mediocrity has turned out to be a gigantic failure. Let us commiserate his Lordship on this gruesome event!! Let him not tell it in Gath and proclaim it in the streets of Ascalon, lest the daughters of Philistine should know it.

3rd February 1895.

VIII.

THE PUBLIC MEMORIAL TO LORD HARRIS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "KAISER-I-HIND."

SIR—The way in which every expression of dissent was stifled and the characteristic impatience which overtook the pledged party at the meeting last Monday made it very clear that the meeting was intended simply to give a public character to some secret understanding of the pledged party by a pantomime process of formal resolutions in the presence of reporters. But for my desire not to create any serious unpleasantness involving disrespect to the chair, however wrong his ruling, I should have objected to every one of the resolutions put before the meeting. In his opening remarks the Chairman distinctly said: "They all knew that H. E. Lord Harris had given considerable time and devoted a good deal of his energy to the development of physical education in this Presidency, and although there might have been differences of opinion on other matters, he believed, nay he was sure, there could be none on the point of this impetus H. E. had given to physical education" and yet when I contended that the subject before the meeting had a hearing on a feature of Lord Harris's administration, I was ruled out of order. So far as the public was aware this was the very first meeting of the peculiar Committee and one would have thought they would have freely discussed (with Committee rules) the very subject before them. But no, it was all a secretly prepared affair which was brought up there only to be invested with a ceremonial with open doors. The whole thing has been at once very misleading and unjustifiable. The subject for consideration was to appreciate and commemorate—either the services which Lord Harris *personally* rendered to sports generally and to cricket in particular by his personal play and example, or a special feature of H. E. Lord Harris's administration, viz. the feature regarding official services and impetus towards the development of physical education in the Presidency. It is the latter that concerns more directly the public, and it is the former that concerns sportsmen and friends of sport. Not many weeks ago it was said that all cricketers and sportsmen generally *both Native and European* intended entertaining Lord Harris to mark their appreciation of his personal hospitality and encouragement to them, and that friends of sport would be invited to join them and help them with subscrip-

tions; and at the merest mention thereof I had readily expressed my assent to contribute my share towards the object, as was done in similar cases, when, for instance, entertainments were given to the English teams that had come out to India to play our local players. But it was with extreme surprise and regret that I noticed a most objectionable change in the programme. The genuine movement of sportsmen to entertain and honour one of them was *nonest*, and the most peculiar *hocus pocus* affair had usurped its place. Lovers of sport from all communities would naturally join our local sportsmen in their genuine and proper movement, even though it was Lord Harris that was the subject of entertainment and honour, for though every native community as a whole has sweet things to remember of Lord Harris as a cricketer and sportsman, but very bitter things indeed of H. E. Lord Harris the Governor. But one need not pursue this subject till the question of the big public memorial is really before the public. All the same all lovers of sport from every native community would be glad to join our local sporting world in its festivities and celebrations in honour of the great sportsman who is about to bid us *adieu*. Let the movement be yet a genuine and proper one and let the objectionable methods be abandoned, if for nothing else, out of simple justice to Lord Harris personally. It is the hateful doctrine of 'the end justifies the means' that is objected to. I was asked by responsible parties at the meeting (after the meeting was over) if I would withdraw my opposition on their making an alteration in the wording of the resolution to meet my contention. But that was again objectionable in itself, and as the whole procedure was unjustifiable and illogical, I could not see my way to agree to the proposal. Rumour has it that some gentlemen have been extremely anxious to give some sort of public memorial to our retiring Governor and that whilst their minds were in awful agitation over some portending notes of trouble in the big game they were at, some solace they sought to obtain and they did obtain by inducting the sportsmen's movement into such channels as would give it a public turn and aspect. Why, they did not want any money for the entertainment or the Shield; any two of them would stand that! All they wanted was names and company. And then sprang into existence the hybrid Committee that was advertised to meet at the 'Gulestan.' And the Committee met only to *declare* that they had desired that a *public* entertainment be given etc. and that a hundred persons be ordered to be their agents to gather taxes to defray the expenses of their jobs. Very grandmotherly Committee this—to say all for the people, nothing by the

people. For if *public* does not mean only non-private, surely the Committee would seem to have taken it upon themselves to do everything in the name of the public without its sanction or mandate. If the entertainment and memorial is to be *by* or *from* the public where was the public meeting held to consider and decide on it? Under whose authority did this very Committee take existence—and what is more—appoint agents to collect funds! Why all this unconstitutional and illogical procedure? Why have not the wire-pullers faced a public meeting? Why all these secret and unbecoming tactics—not to say tricks—if there was such a general public agreement on the special question that was so much emphasised by the chairman of last Monday's meeting? A public memorial to H. E. Lord Harris as Governor of Bombay is believed to be in the process of preparation, and it is quite a novel thing indeed to see at the same time separate meetings and separate collections to commemorate separate features of His Excellency's administration. If it, indeed, be that the big memorial game bids fair to be lost, and this toy show was clutched at just to force some sort of public recognition of H. E.'s administration, surely they could be no friends of His Excellency who by their action make it plain to the world that, after all, it is only his doings in regard to sport and cricket that the public would agree to commemorate. The memorial voted at the Gulestan Meeting is no public memorial in any sense of the term, and it may be that the public may challenge the right of those who have posed as its delegates and interpreters, and accredited fund gatherers. And oddly enough the memorial is not even a sportsman's memorial for the very simple reason that not even 10 p. c. of the Gulestan gathering represented sportsmen and the Europeans, the premier sportsmen in India, had to a man kept away from the meeting as well as from the bogus committee! So that it is neither fish, fowl, nor red herring. Is such a mongrel memorial worth anybody's acceptance? And why have the Europeans held aloof? Is it because they know that a *public* memorial to an administrator for his encouragement to sports from his official position would be laughed at in their own country? Did the friends of Lord Rosebery, the Prime Minister of England, go tax-gathering to collect funds for *public* memorial to him for his excellent encouragement to sports while in office and for his owning the famous Ladas? If public memorials are to be so easily won by our Governors by merely showing good form and fellowship on the cricket field or at a Gymkhana table, they need no more sweat in the close atmosphere of the Secretariat or the office chambers but lay themselves out for achievements in the open air. For an estimate of the interest taken by His Excellency's Government in the matter of physical education, one need go no farther than His Excellency's own utterances. Things were in progress long before his time and his Government did all that could be expected of any other Government. But he personally did more than any Governor has done or would even venture to do—with the local teams and with members of his own household and set out all matches from start to finish.

K. N. BAHADHURJI.

13th January 1895.

THE "GUJARATI."

(ANGLO-VERNACULAR.)

I.

Nearly two months ago it was announced in these columns that a movement had been set on foot to raise a memorial to Lord Harris. The friends and admirers of Lord Lansdowne did not find it difficult to collect a handsome fund for raising his bronze statue with the help of donations from Native princes, Zemindars and Maharajas. These good-natured people are very obliging and the gentlest hint is sufficient to induce them to do anything to please Governors, Lieutenant Governors and Viceroys. The major part of the above fund was subscribed by them, whilst his Lordship's countrymen, official and non-official, showed their admiration for him principally by organizing the movement. Who the originators of the present movement are it would be interesting to know. The name of the princes, who have subscribed for Lord Harris memorial, have already been published in our vernacular columns. If this list is genuine, it is beyond controversy that these chiefs must have been approached by some person or persons, official or non-official. The question, therefore, arises in whose name was this movement started and why has so much secrecy been observed about the affair! The memorial mania is fast spreading in spite of Sir William Wedderburn's interpellation in Parliament about Lord Lansdowne's statue. The admirers of high official personages are, in our judgment, overdoing their part and we should not be surprised if the rumour that a public protest might be made in one or two principal cities in this Presidency against the projected memorial turned out to be correct. Weeks ago we pointed out that in ancient times statues were voted only to great heroes and that this unique distinction is being degraded in these days of selfishness and hypocrisy. Memorials at the expense of Chiefs and Princes are becoming very common and it is time that this most objectionable practice should once for all be exposed in its true colours. The greatest reward a ruler can have is the affection and gratitude of his subjects and it is lamentable that attempts should now and then be made to lower its value by putting up fictitious memorials for all sorts of exalted mediocrities. In a country like India, where the people can exer-

cise little or no restraining influence upon governors and viceroys, memorials should not be reduced to the level of trinkets but reserved only for persons of exceptional ability and sterling merits. No one bears any ill-will towards Lord Harris. Personally he is said to be frank and courteous. But as an administrator he has to the bitter disappointment of the people signally failed in almost all the important questions his Government has had to deal with. We find it difficult to believe that His Excellency could have lent countenance to any movement to raise his memorial. We yet hope his Lordship's friends and admirers will not place him in a false position. The following list of subscriptions promised by some of the native states is as interesting as it is significant :—

NATIVE STATES.			Rupees.
Bhavnagar 5,000
Junaghad 1,000
Jamnagar 1,000
Chitli 1,000
Porbandar 700
Morbi 500
Landi 500
Gondal 500
Lunawada 500
Wadhwan 500
Dharampore 500
Idar 500
Palanpore 500
Dhrangadhra 500
Chhuda 400
Sayla 400
Rajkote 100

Total.....Rs. 14,400

18th November 1895

II.

AN APPEAL TO NATIVE PRINCES FOR LORD HARRIS' MEMORIAL FUND.

We have more than once alluded in these columns to the contemplated memorial of Lord Harris. To us personally it is unpleasant to have to recur to this subject. But a duty to the public must be discharged, however unpleasant the task may be. We publish below the appeal that has been addressed to native chiefs and princes. This communication

confirms all the objections that we have all along taken to the practice of making princes contribute towards the memorials of Governors, Lieutenant-Governors and Viceroy. As every one knows, *their* is a very delicate position and that incapacitates them altogether from resisting the gentlest pressure put on them. It is not difficult to imagine the effect upon their minds of an invitation like the one that has been conveyed to them, especially on the eve of His Excellency's tour through Kathiawar. The subject is too serious to induce us to comment upon the faulty English of the communication. But we cannot silently pass over the extraordinary statements it contains. Is it really a fact that "there is a *general* desire on the part of the *various* communities to testify fitly before his departure to the *high* and *sincere* esteem in which His Excellency is held?" The next sentence is so fearfully constructed that we refrain from commenting upon it further than remarking that straightforwardness and manliness alone do not entitle any personage, however high-placed, to a memorial any more than an ordinary individual is entitled for similar distinction for the possession of similar qualities. The communication is conveniently silent as regards the names of the originators of the "permanent memorial" movement. We fail to see the propriety of calling upon "Your Highness" to take a *prominent* part in the excellent movement, when it has excited so much opposition throughout the Presidency. The princes are told that their answers to this preliminary appeal are *expected* to be *favourable*. This is, indeed, a very refined method to reach the pockets of the helpless princes, and as our readers must have seen from the list of promised subscriptions which appeared in these columns, it has already wonderfully succeeded. It seems the proposers of the movement intend calling a public meeting. If the movement has the sympathy of the public, why has it been incubated in secret? Memorials ought to be the outward manifestation of the general feeling of the public and it is not easy to understand why native princes should be made to figure so prominently in the list of contributors, when the people directly under His Excellency's rule are opposed to any memorial being raised. We strongly protest against the present attempt to give the movement a public character. We also emphatically protest against making native princes lay the nucleus of the memorial fund by their so-called voluntary contributions and thus endeavouring to influence public opinion. If the people of Western India desire to perpetuate the memory of their ruler, let the appeal go forth in their name in an open and public manner. If they do not, they have a right to repudiate any attempt that may be made to appeal on their

behalf for subscriptions. The memorial mania is fast spreading and must be put down with a firm hand. It would be a serious misfortune to the people of this country, if they allowed their views on such an important question to be successfully defied. They ought to make their voice heard in time and it is in the discharge of this public duty that we have deemed it necessary to enter our emphatic protest against the present movement.

25th November 1894.

III.

There is absolutely no foundation whatever for the rumour that is being sedulously propagated in certain quarters that the Hon. Mr. P. M. Mehta, the Hon. Mr. Justice Ranade and one or two other leading Hindus have already joined the Lord Harris memorial movements. The object of spreading such reports is too transparent to deceive the more thoughtful and cautious section of the public. But as attempts are being made to induce some of our simple-minded and generous-hearted shettias to join the movement and as such reports are likely to mislead them, we think it our duty to flatly contradict the rumour that the above-named gentlemen not only cordially sympathise with the movement but have actually joined it. Those who wish to join it are welcome to do so. That is their look-out. But let them not take an irrevocable step with a wrong impression in their mind. Memorials should not be raised in an indiscriminate manner, especially in a country like India where the people have so few means of exercising a restraining influence upon high-placed officers. There is a solemn duty cast upon every citizen in regard to this question and though some publicists might regard got-up memorials as pleasing ceremonials and yet preach lessons on moral courage and other moral and social virtues, we must frankly declare our conviction that it is a grave dereliction of public duty for any one to lend even his moral support to a movement of which the innermost heart and conscience of the native community does not and cannot approve.

23rd December.

IV.

We are glad some of the leading Hindu, Mahomedan and Parsee citizens of Bombay have formed themselves into a provisional committee with the object of giving an entertainment to Lord Harris in recognition of the keen and uniform interest his Lordship has consistently taken.

in furthering the cause of physical education in this Presidency. Our attitude in regard to the larger movement is well known and on public grounds of the highest importance we still adhere to that view. It is, therefore, the more gratifying to us to support the present movement. Credit must be given where credit is due and there is not the least doubt that during his administration His Excellency has done not a little to rouse the interest of the native community in the promotion of physical training. The Parsee cricket team has fully established its reputation under his direct patronage and we feel sure if Hindoos and Mahomedans had like representative teams, Lord Harris would have likewise extended his sympathy and encouragement to them also. The Hindu community owe their Gymkhana site to his Government and the discussion that Dr. Bhandarkar and the Hon. Mr. Justice Ranade started in connection with the premature deaths of Indian graduates was taken up and completed by His Excellency's Government by eliciting authoritative views from experienced educational officers on the desirability of enforcing physical education and by issuing a final resolution on the subject. Owing to climatic influences and strange social notions prevalent in India grown-up persons and men of position especially very rarely participate in out-door games. Lord Harris is an ardent sportsman and his continuous presence on the cricket-field from day to day throughout the inter-presidential and other well known matches, though it has been differently interpreted and judged by different persons, has served as a wholesome object-lesson to natives of social influence and position and to modify some of their mistaken notions in regard to out-door games and recreation. In many of his speeches delivered in this city as well as in the mofussil he has invariably stood up for the physical cult. The social force that His Excellency has thus powerfully strengthened is not destined to exhaust itself after his departure. With a view to commemorate this feature of his *regime* it is intended to apply the surplus after covering the expenses of the proposed entertainment to his awarding a cup or shield bearing His Excellency's name. The idea is, indeed, a very happy one and has the cordial support of the public.

6th January 1895

V.

THE attempt to raise Lord Lansdowne's statue and to commemorate the name of Lord Harris gives rise to some painful reflections. If native princes cannot resist any pressure put upon them, we are not prepared

to be hard upon them. In some respects their position is even more delicate and less independent than that of private individuals. They are more or less at the mercy of government and their political officers ; and having regard to their previous training and education they cannot be expected to show that moral strength which one has a right to expect in ordinary citizens. There is no doubt that if some of them could pluck up moral courage to resist all pressure, there would be less disposition to make undue demands upon their goodness and generosity. Whatever excuse there may be in their case, there is hardly any in the case of other private individuals who allow themselves to be blindly led. Why is it that the Hindoo community does not receive that respectful treatment which one would naturally expect it should meet with? The answer is very simple. The Hindoos as a race have not learnt to respect themselves. They have not yet realized the true dignity of independence and moral courage. False notions about greatness and the responsibilities of wealth are so largely prevalent that they very easily subordinate their own judgment to that of an energetic and masterful organizer of any movement. Let a movement be started to raise Sir Richard Temple's memorial. There are friends and admirers ready to please him. Some European gentlemen organize measures to perpetuate Lord Lansdowne's memory. Maharajas, Rajas and Zamindars at once flock together to do *pooja* and subscribe large sums. A similar tale is going to be repeated in this Presidency and it remains to be seen how many of our wealthy citizens are prepared to join this movement. Statues, monuments and memorials, when they are voted to persons who do not deserve them, afford lasting testimony to the unwisdom of those that confer such marks of distinction. Memorials of great statesmen and philanthropists do credit to the head and heart of the people who raise them. They indicate a higher moral ideal, a higher standard of political and social morality. When Rome degraded these marks of public honour, her power and glory had already begun to decline and the most severe condemnation that Indians could pass upon themselves would be their thoughtless co-operation in any movement to perpetuate the memory of administrations bearing lamentable traces of political incapacity and absolutely devoid of any memorable acts of higher statesmanship. We will not repeat here the epithet that Mr. Surendranath Bannerjee employed at Madras to describe such memorials. But it is certainly a scandal and a disgrace to India that while charitable, educational, social and political institutions should starve for want of funds, thousands and thousands should now and then be wasted over trumpery memorials.

From the following letter it is clear that the Lord Harris memorial movement is about to advance a stage further within the next week. Shethias and other persons of wealth and position were, it is reported, approached and appealed to for at least small or nominal subscriptions. But some of them were shrewd enough to understand the true significance of this request and asked to be excused. Our readers are well aware that the Hon. Mr. P. M. Mehta, the Hon. Mr. Javerilal and the Hon. Justice Ranade have not joined the movement. But it is now pretty certain that Lord Harris' friends and admirers are quite serious and the Municipal Hall—the Hall of the ratepayers most of whom do not sympathise with the movement—is to be used for the purpose of deciding what steps should be taken to raise a suitable memorial to His Excellency. The question that the public have now to decide is whether they will allow their opinion to be set at naught in connection with the important subject of raising memorials to all sorts of exalted personages. It is with very great reluctance that we have to allude to this question. But since it is so often thrust upon the notice of the public, publicists cannot ignore it. Some time ago it was contemplated in Bombay as well as in Poona to enter a public protest against the present movement and we have grounds to believe that the idea is likely to assume a definite form within a short time. We are sorry this should be so. But those who wish to make their voice publicly heard against the practice of degrading memorials in India are not to blame, because they are being driven into that unpleasant position by lovers of statues and other memorials and their admiring followers. We sincerely hope Lord Harris will not allow himself to be placed in a false position. The following letter has been sent round :—

Bombay 5th January 1895,

Dear Sir,

Will you kindly attend a Preliminary Meeting called for Tuesday the 15th Instant at 5 p. m. at the Municipal Hall, to discuss and resolve upon the steps to be taken to raise a suitable memorial to His Excellency Lord Harris, G.C.I.E., on the expiration of his term of office as Governor of Bombay'

Yours faithfully,

H. A. Acworth,
Fazulbhoy Vishram.
George Cotton,
Harkisondas Narotamdas,
A. F. Beaufort,
Nowroji N. Wadia.

17th January 1895.

VI.

LORD HARRIS MEMORIAL.

In the last issue of this paper we expressed our surprise that the Municipal Hall, which was the Hall of the Corporation as representing the rate-payers who did not sympathise with the Lord Harris memorial movement, was going to be used for the purposes of the preliminary meeting. Little did we dream at the time that a protest would be sent the very next day to the Municipal Commissioner against the use of the Hall without the consent of the Corporation. It was signed by 25 Corporators representing the Hindu, Parsee, Portuguese and Mahomedan communities. Under ordinary circumstances we do not think any such protest would have been made. But the Corporation was treated very shabbily in some instances by Lord Harris' government and we believe that partly accounts for the prompt protest that was forwarded. At the same time Mr. Badroodin Abdulla Koor was also right in pointing out that the protest was necessary in defence of the principal involved in the question. Besides if the public of Bombay are against the memorial movement, it seems anomalous that their Hall should be used without the consent of their representatives.

20th January 1895.

VII.

The following letter was circulated amongst members of the bar on the Original side of the High Court.

LORD HARRIS MEMORIAL FUND.

Bombay, January 7, 1895.

May I inquire if you will consent to allow your name to be associated with a Memorial Fund to commemorate His Excellency Lord Harris' connection with this Presidency for the last five years, and if so would you mind putting down your name in the accompanying list?

The subscribers hereafter are to decide what form the memorial is to take.

Yours faithfully,

A. F. BEAUFORT.

We have given above the letter that was sent this week to members of the bar on the Original Side of the High Court. Last time we published the invitation that was addressed to several other people.

From both of them it is perfectly clear that Lord Harris' friends and admirers are trying hard to procure subscriptions. The result of the herculean efforts that have for some time been made is, however, very disappointing. But the promoters of the movement are brave men and having put their hands to the work, they are bound to carry it through. It has been announced in the papers that "*a large meeting of representative European and Native inhabitants*" was held at the rooms of the Chamber of Commerce. Writers who are so fond of dwelling upon the non-representative character of the congress have wonderful notions about "representative European and Native inhabitants." We deny there was a single representative Hindoo at the meeting. We doubt if the Parsee community will admit that the Parsee gentlemen who attended the meeting represent its genuine feeling. Even a cursory examination of the list of subscribers shows that about Rs. 22,000 were subscribed by native chiefs and princes and the remaining Rs. 3,000 by Europeans, Parsees, Mahomedans and a sprinkling of Hindoos. It has been settled to hold a meeting of the friends and admirers of Lord Harris at the Town Hall on the 29th instant. We do not know what value His Excellency places on such a testimonial, when the rest of the entire native community has held aloof from the movement. His Lordship has been praised for his frankness. But if he had that quality of the right kind, the best thing he could have done in the interests of his own reputation was to have discouraged any such partisan movement which is likely to evoke opposition in different parts of the presidency.

What is the value of a memorial which has not the sympathy of the public? We should have thought that the whole thing was simply worthless. But we do not expect His Excellency to entertain the same view as we do and he is welcome to accept such a testimonial. Statues have been raised to administrators whose memory no one now cherishes and if it is contemplated to add one more to the list, we wish success to His Excellency's "friends and admirers." As long as the world lasts, human vanity there will be and it must be gratified. Lord Harris comes from a country where the value of statues and memorials is well appreciated. We do not know of any recent instance of an English statesman or politician being honoured by "his friends and admirers" at a public meeting. Such absurd anomalies are not tolerated in the healthier atmosphere of England. But in India Englishmen as well as some of their principles undergo rapid and extraordinary changes and anything if possible provided a masterful organiser puts himself at the head of a movement. What the "friends and admirers" are going to say at the Town Hall meeting it is

difficult to foretell. People are asking why these good people should be anxious to make themselves publicly heard, when they can render *pooja* in private. But the devout *Poojarees* must have reasons of their own and we need not waste time in scanning them with any particular care. Can it be, as some people allege, that some of them are anxious to acknowledge their gratitude for the favours received? Can it be that some are eager to lay the foundation of their future fame? A few, who might be clever thought-readers and must have unerringly read his Lordship's thoughts, might be desirous of transmitting to England the fumes of the incense they mean to burn before the shrine of their idol. The Parliament might be dissolved in the near future and there are already rumours about Lord Elgin's retirement and Lord Harris' succession to the viceroyalty. There might be others who are thoroughly disinterested friends and admirers. But their reasons and motives no honest publicist will ever question.

Why hole and corner memorials are objectionable is best illustrated by the present movement. They leave no room for independent action and even freedom of conviction is at an end. Genuine public opinion is twisted, distorted and misrepresented. Such movements scarcely exercise any ennobling influence on the givers or the receivers. The Maharaja of Kolhapur, who occupied the foremost place in the New Year's Decorations, has come forward with a princely contribution of Rs. 4,000. The Chief of Janjira, who was also one of the recipients of distinction, has subscribed Rs. 1,000. The subscription lists and the lists of decorations are not inseparably connected and no one can suggest in the present case that the princely donors were prompted by anything but feelings of admiration and friendship. But such acts of generosity are liable to be misconstrued, and we are sorry Lord Harris and his friends have not realized the mischievous consequences of the present movement which could not have been started without his tacit consent or acquiescence. Lord Reay tapped the springs of public charity by encouraging philanthropic and wealthy citizens, and the public of Bombay rendered him spontaneous homage. Here, however, is an instance in which two rulers were honoured by Her Majesty at the instance of Lord Harris' government, who have come forward with liberal contributions to the memorial fund. We are sorry their action is liable to be misunderstood. Lord Harris' own attitude towards the movement is also apt to be misinterpreted. He either approves of it or disapproves of it or is indifferent to it. In the first case the public are not much to blame, if they misconstrue the subscribers' intentions and Lord Harris' action in lending his moral sup-

port to the movement. In the latter case the movement would never have entered upon the stage it has reached.

The practice of exploiting the pockets of native princes for raising memorials to Governors, Lieutenant-Governors and Viceroy has now become so frequent that it is now time that the matter should be fully ventilated in Parliament and in the English and Indian Press. It is in fact growing into a public scandal and deserves the most vigilant and careful attention of our contemporaries. More than 50 or 60 thousand rupees were subscribed by native princes to the Lansdowne Memorial Fund. Nearly 22 thousand rupees out of nearly 25 thousand have been received from the same source for Lord Harris' memorial. Is it not a shameful thing that while the bulk of the people directly under the rule of Governors and Viceroy do not care to raise any memorial, nay are even opposed to the movement, native princes, who dare not resist, nor speak out their convictions, are made to subscribe princely sums? Why should the money belonging to the taxpayers of native states be thus diverted for objects in which they are not at all interested? Subjects of native states are as helpless as their own rulers and it is not a little to be lamented that responsible high officials like Lord Lansdowne and Lord Harris, who in their own country, are so jealous of the tax-payer's money, lend their support to movements which mean nothing less than depriving the subjects of native states of the benefit of the taxes with which they are more than sufficiently burdened.

The *Times of India* wrote on the 17th March 1880 :—"It is difficult to estimate the mischief that has been thoughtlessly done by those who perhaps merely wished to make themselves agreeable to a man of Sir Richard Temple's influence and position *The promoters were surely in fault not to have made such inquiries and taken such precautions as would have prevented the unseemly spectacle presented when we see the promoters ranged on the one side and the native public on the other of a scheme in which all should have joined.*" Some natives of position had also joined this movement and yet the *Times* was constrained to deplore the spectacle of a partizan meeting. History repeats itself and on the 29th of this month the Town Hall will present a similar spectacle. In the present case there is not even that shred of excuse which the *Times* urged in favour of the promoters of Sir Richard Temple's memorial, because for months past the leading organs of native opinion not only in Western India but also in the other provinces have strongly opposed the present movement. There is a universal belief that it has been started and orga-

nized by a few European gentlemen and their native friends. The entire native community, with the exception of a few stray individuals, has held aloof from the movement. Owing to various unfortunate circumstances never were racial and religious feelings so embittered as under the present regime throughout the Presidency and it is quite in keeping with this feature of Lord Harris' administration that even the memorial that is being raised in his honour has assumed a partizan character. We are disposed to believe that it is likely to meet with general opposition and evoke very unfavourable criticism. All this Lord Harris could have avoided by giving better advice to his friends and admirers. We are sorry that even his departure should leave any unpleasant reminiscences behind. But for this it is not the public that are responsible but those who contemptuously set them at defiance.

20th January 1895.

VIII.

MEMORIALS AND ENTERTAINMENTS

TO

VICEROYS, GOVERNORS

ET HOC GENUS !!!

How the spirit of self-abasement degrades those who give such
Memorials to undeserving administrators!

Who are the true representatives of Native thought and feeling?

Read, mark and inwardly digest.

(Extract from "New India," by the Hon'ble

H. J. Cotton, Bengal Civil Service.)

We derive the most false impressions of native thought from the native with whom we do come in contact. The best type of native gentlemen do not usually come in contact with us at all; and it is hardly the language of hyperbole if I say that the real leaders of opinion are (with a few exceptions) men of whose existence even we are unconscious. Those whom we do meet are either officials or else gentlemen of property and position, with whom it is a traditional duty to pay their respects to those in authority over them. The Rai Bahadoors and the Rajahs

and Nawabs who are honoured by a private audience with the Viceroy and the Lieutenant-Governors of provinces are not the leaders of the people. They are men of rank and dignity, and are therefore entitled to honourable consideration, but they are not representatives of the nation in any sense. Their conversation is not the echo of native views and sentiments. Their voice strikes no responsive chord among the people. Still less are those natives in any degree representative whose highest pleasure it appears to be to fawn upon and flatter the members of the ruling race. There is no more satisfactory token of the higher standard of thought which has accompanied English education than the thorough spirit of contempt with which these men are regarded by the stronger and more restless and independent among their fellow-countrymen. There are wealthy native gentlemen who court the company of officials, and do not scruple to dispose of their native guests with scanty ceremony, while they reserve the grandest display, the richest luxuries, and the choicest amusements for the delectation of their European guests. At such entertainments, where Viceroys and Lieutenant-Governors have been spectators, I have seen caricatures of Indian life presented on the stage for the amusement of Europeans. These caricatures are amusing, no doubt, but for the Englishmen who behold them they only afford material for satire, and for increasing the contempt with which the natives are already regarded. The spirit of self-abasement which degrades itself to giving such an entertainment excites indignation in nobler minds; and yet English officials, from the Viceroy downwards, who are held to honour such spectacles by their presence, believe that by so doing they ingratiate themselves with the native community, and bridge the gulf between the races. Vain delusion! They foster the pushing, the cringing, the slavish instinct among the natives, which needs no encouragement. The really best men among the natives of India, who influence opinion and lead society not less by their intellectual accomplishments than in virtue of the moral qualities of honesty and independence, are naturally of a more retiring disposition and somewhat proud. They do not care to make the acquaintance of Government officials if they can help it, and they do not thrust themselves on the Government. They are not to be found on railway platforms to receive officials or bid them good-bye; they do not attend meetings with the sole object of picking up influential acquaintances. They do not dedicate books to officials, organise ovations for them, or seek to perpetuate their names by public buildings, like roads and so forth. Wise in their own reticence, dignified in their self-respect, the true leaders of native opinion

pursue their own course with as little communication with Europeans as is consistent with the exercise of their full influence. Englishmen hear little of them, and the Government, as a rule, knows them not; but their names are household words among the homes of the people * * *

No one can pretend to possess any knowledge of native feeling who does not keep his finger on the pulse of public opinion in the Presidency towns. There is a growing unanimity of opinion throughout India, based on the increased solidarity of native thought and the spread of English education. The people of India cannot but act and think as that section of the community which monopolises the knowledge of politics and administration may instruct them. The educated classes are the voice and brain of the country.

20th January, 1895.

IX.

The memorial mania is spreading gradually. The number of friends and admirers is slowly increasing. In Poona a few of them met on Wednesday last and sang the praises of their idol. Khan Bahadur Dorabjee in a gushing speech full of enthusiastic admiration for Lord Harris was good enough to proclaim to the Poonaites and others that His Excellency "*was not behind any of his predecessors.*" It will be a news to many people of the Presidency that there are persons who look upon his Lordship as Elphinstone's or Lord Reay's equal. When Sir Richard Temple was about to depart from these shores, a trumped-up public meeting was held at which his hero-worshippers chanted hymns of praise in his honour. One of the reasons put forward for raising a memorial to him was that he had taken part in the inauguration ceremonies of several institutions, neither with the conception nor initiation of which he had the remotest connection. Similarly one of Lord Harris' titles to memorial is declared to be that His Excellency "*had distributed honours without any regard to caste, creed or political opinions.*" We are not sure how far even this observation is correct. But assuming it to be well founded, we doubt whether this precious and original reason will be accepted by any historian worth the name as a sufficient justification for a memorial or that he will have the boldness to claim equality for his Lordship with Elphinstone. The present movement shows how contemporary history can be manufactured in order to gratify human vanity and how public opinion is grossly distorted and misrepresented.

27th January 1895.

X.

UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS.

1

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Gujarati*.

Sir,—The University incident of Monday before last raises some very important questions affecting not only the dignity but the very constitution of the University, and I trust, you will allow me space in your valued journal. The subject may be considered under three heads—1st. Some points regarding the rules of conduct of business: 2nd. The question of special addresses to the senate 3rd. Has the Chancellor or the Vice-Chancellor the right to appoint special Convocation days i. e. call special Convocation meetings of the Senate i. e. meetings for conferring degrees, for the purpose of giving addresses whenever it should be the pleasure of or convenient to either the Chancellor or the Vice-Chancellor to do so?

Of late there have been many sad exhibitions of most extraordinary interpretations of the University Senate rules for the convening and conduct of Senate meetings, but the exhibition of Monday before last has beaten all previous displays. The Vice-Chancellor and his coadjutors of the Syndicate—distinguished members of the various Faculties including that of Law, after mature consideration of the statutes affecting the constitution of the University make a referendum to the Senate asking them if it be their wish to alter their *annual Convocation date* just for this year i. e., to abrogate for the time being, one of their by-laws, to enable their Chancellor to deliver an address to them. It soon became known that a tolerably fair number of the Senate believed that no sufficient cause was shown for the granting of the supplication, and that opposition would be offered in the Senate meeting of Monday before last. Attempts were made from the highest quarters to *sumjao* the opposition but in vain. It is said that the opposition were in a minority. All the same it was plain that the simple fear of a discussion on the subject of the supplication had driven the pro-address-and graceful party to methods which were neither dignified nor in accordance with the prescribed rules for the conduct of Senate meetings. It was certainly no dignified procedure to call the Senate together for a *special purpose* and then abruptly to dismiss them without even the courtesy of a reason for the abrupt treatment—such is grace as understood by the graceful and courteous party! It was

very like a village *Puntoji* suddenly dismissing his little school-children with—Go home my boys. I don't want you to-day—perhaps because he was confused or the little worm in his inside had given a sudden turn! It was neither dignified nor in accordance with rules for the mover of a proposition to be present and to rise only to say "I decline to move my proposition;" and the Vice-Chancellor certainly exceeded his powers when without consulting the wish of the meeting, if the proposer be allowed permission to withdraw his motion or giving a moment's time to the meeting, he was on his legs, the instant the mover sat down, to dissolve the meeting, with 'express' haste. The recognised procedure is that a proposition drops if the mover be absent and nobody takes it up from him. Should the mover be present—the rules require that he should withdraw from the meeting should he desire his proposition not to be put; and this was the procedure that had to be carried out under similar circumstances not many weeks ago. It would seem as if the precipitate and irregular retreat was previously, and purposely arranged to escape every possibility of uncomfortable discussion and dissent.

The University is concerned with higher Education. It has no direct connection with primary or even *physical* Education. Addresses to the Senate have of late been more personal defences or apologies or attacks in matters of social and socio-political concern, and it was time the Senate set its face against all such attempts to utilize the function of a convocation for the purposes of reading lectures on matters far removed from it, if not altogether unconnected with the subject of liberal or higher education. Addresses on Education from acknowledged educationalists of repute would, no doubt, be welcome, but even such addresses however much it may be desired to have them delivered before a Senate meeting, cannot be inflicted on the Senate without their permission, by any distorted and irregular interpretation of the rules of the Senate regarding the powers of the Vice-Chancellor. It is said H. E. Lord Harris who has had in his personal keeping the Education port-folio has matured some views on Education, which would be worth knowing. But surely if it be special views on Education only that are desired to be made known, which method or channel could be more appropriate and more effectual for the purpose than that of a minute by H. E. on Education: a method by which the educational machinery could be most easily and effectively put into motion for the purpose of making the matured views fructify? Much stress has been laid on what is called courtesy and grace. But surely the University is no place for friends and admirers to make, much

less insist upon making their courtesy to the object of their worship, for in the Temple of Knowledge all goes by merit tested by hard and strict tests without distinction not only of caste, colour or creed but also of personal position, social or otherwise. *Jo hookum* courtury, which is but a species of dignified servility, cannot be allowed any place in the consideration of University matters.

27th January 1895.

A FELLOW OF THE UNIVERSITY.

XI.

THE TOWN HALL MEMORIAL MEETING. A HUGE FIASCO!!

WHO ARE THE TRUE REPRESENTATIVES OF WEALTH
AND EDUCATION? ANS:—VICTORIAFULS OF MAR-
WADEES AND MULTANEES, AND MILLOWNERS'
CLERKS.

The proceedings of the Town Hall meeting which after a good deal of *zhutput* interested admirers succeeded in holding, were, according to the most reliable and independent reports, of the most uninteresting character. Some of the speakers, whose speeches have been reported at length, were inaudible and discreetly brief; others well nigh exhausted the patience of the audience. If the proceedings were so devoid of any interest, the composition of the gathering affords food for a good deal of reflexion on the ethics of memorial movements. All the well-known leading members of the various sections of the Hindu community were conspicuous by their absence. The public men of this city were also more profitably engaged in other avocations than joining the members of the Mutual Adulation Society. Persons utterly unknown to fame have had celebrity thrust upon them in the imposing list of the gentlemen reported to be present. Marwadies, sharebrokers, fitters, engineers, and millowner's clerks who have had special opportunities of appreciating the statesmanlike acts of Lord Harris, of course, mustered strong. Victoriafuls of them were, it is reported, specially brought to the meeting and most of them did not know at all why their presence was required. As Lord Harris' notions of representative Hindoos, Parsees, and Mahomedans are very consistent, he will, of course, accept a memorial at their hands with his usual "frankness and straightforwardness which quality found so many gushing admirers in the Town Hall. 'Bombay is pretty strong in Hindu public

men with sufficiently eloquent tongues and intelligent shettias. But the promoters, disappointed in their attempt to secure them, indited one Poona man. One of them was Dr. Bhandarkar, and the other one Mr. Adhicary absolutely unknown to fame. This gentleman was at one time in Baroda but there any how his judicial services were not very highly appreciated. He came forward to do homage as an ancient watan-dar and who will say that he is not the foremost representative of the Hindu community? If memorialwahas can manufacture memorials they can also manufacture representative natives.

Tuesday's Town Hall meeting was a counterpart of the memorial meeting held in the same place nearly 15 years ago on the eve of Sir Richard Temple's departure. Its promoters knew beforehand that if they gave the movement a public aspect, they would meet with certain opposition. So they were forced to acknowledge that the gathering was of friends and admirers. Sir Richard Temple's Memorial Meeting was presided over by Sir Michael Westropp, the then Chief Justice of the Bombay High Courts and the services of men like the Hon. Mr. Justice West, the Hon. Mr. Mowatt and Mr. Latham were specially requisitioned. This week the European element was not so strong. With these differences both the meetings supply interesting historical parallels. Praise of such extravagant character was showered upon Sir Richard Temple that even the local English dailies after the departure of their idol turned round and showed their dislike of indiscriminate laudation. Lord Harris, we are afraid, has been also similarly covered with such glory as ought to gratify the heart of the vainest monarch who is able to say "I am the lord of all I survey." A leading Mahomedan gentleman, who is so much respected even now, was one of the speakers at the Sir Richard Temple Memorial Meeting. Mr. Dharamsey was to the surprise of many one of the speakers at the last Tuesday's meeting. There were letters and telegrams from princes, nobles and other interested persons read at the Town Hall 15 years ago. The same tale was literally repeated this week. Sir Richard Temple was praised as the second founder of the University, the founder of an infant school of administrators, friend of the poor and famine-stricken, thousands of whom had fallen victims to his inhuman 1 lb. ration policy and for having presided at the opening ceremonies of several institutions. Lord Harris too has been praised for having removed the Kolaba Lunatic Asylum to another place with the help of Bai Putlibai's generosity—we are sorry for the lady who gets nothing more than empty thanks—and for having presided at many social

functions. He has been extolled for his impartiality, straightforwardness and frankness, though the Hindu community throughout the Presidency has been bitterly complaining against his policy in dealing with interracial dissensions and though it has now been proved to the hilt that his Lordship was not impartial in singling out one community for violent denunciation. Sir Richard Temple was anxious to enter Parliament and Lord Harris is, as hinted at by his admirers, desirous to come out as Viceroy. Hence so much fuss, tomtomming and wire-pulling in both the instances. We might go on making the analogy more complete. But we must here pause and reserve some energy and space to notice the superlative praise and glory with which his Lordship was literally overwhelmed.

Inexperienced persons are likely to be misled by the roseate and audaciously inaccurate reports of the Town Hall meeting of friends and admirers. But the other historical parallel we have cited will convince them how easily a meeting can be got up in India to raise a memorial to any Governor. Be it said to the everlasting disgrace of Bengal, that though it could not raise a decent memorial to Lord Ripon it collected 75 thousand rupees for Lord Lansdowne's statue. This is another parallel in contemporary history. Though the present movement has been cleverly managed, its transparent character cannot be disguised. It is essentially an official movement worked through non-official hands and the wonder is only 45 thousand rupees have been subscribed and not some lacs. It is a noteworthy circumstance that out of eleven speakers four were officials and one a retired official and that not a few out of the whole set had reasons to be grateful to their idol.

One of the most striking features of the adulation in which Lord Harris' friends and admirers indulged to their hearts' content is the number of gross inaccuracies to be found in their utterances. The Chairman remarked "*the idea of such a memorial has been heartily received throughout the Presidency.*" The Ven. Archdeacon Goldwyer-Lewis, who is a religious minister and ought to be more accurate in his statements observed "Lord Harris has secured the confidence, the respect and the admiration of all classes in this Presidency." Both these gentlemen cannot be ignorant of the fact that the entire native press, Marathi and Gujarati, representing a vast body of native opinion, are entirely opposed to the movement and we protest against the audacious statement that it has met with the sympathy of all classes. The meeting was described at the meeting and outside as a representative one. Surely the

self-satisfied and conceited critics of the native press ought to set a better example, if their comments are ever to command a grain of respect at the hands of those for whom they are intended.

The Chairman showed considerable ingenuity when he tried by a show of some figures that the present movement had met with wider support than the memorial of Lord Reay. If there was one thing more than another that distinguished almost all the speeches, that was the number of fallacious assumptions and platitudes in which they indulged. The total number of subscribers to the Lord Reay memorial was 254, while 399 persons have subscribed on the present occasion. Therefore, it is argued, that the present movement is more popular. This is a wonderful specimen of logic. But even the dullest reader of Mill will at once perceive that the genuineness and popularity of a movement is not always demonstrated by the mere number of subscribers. If the clerks of merchants, marwaries, sharebrokers, engineers, fitters and Mooltanis numbering about 1,000 had been induced to contribute two annas each, the number of subscribers to-day would have been 1,399. Who would not then have said that Lord Harris was not the most popular and successful ruler England had ever sent or is likely to send to India?

Mr. Cotton, as a member of the Corporation, is well known as a sober Corporator. But as an admirer and friend of Lord Harris he was so much swayed by his partisan spirit that we do not think in his cooler moments he will approve of everything that he has said. Even granting that all he said is true about his Lordship's social virtues and administrative achievements, we were hardly prepared for the remark that Lord Harris was a "statesman." As an Englishman knowing well his own mother tongue and English politics, he showed a strange lack of appreciation of the significance of the word "statesman." If Lord Harris is a statesman, even Mr. Cotton and the rest of the admirers are also statesman. It is the fate of one-sided movements that their organizers are lost to all sense of fitness and proportion in things. We believe the speaker's young son in England unwittingly appreciated the situation better than his admiring father when he called Lord Harris *Captain of the County Eleven*. During the regime of every governor, whether successful or otherwise, some measures are necessarily sanctioned in the course of official routine. But it would be absurd to say, therefore, that they are the result of *statesmanship*. Lord Harris' speeches in the moffussil are cited in proof of his intimate knowledge of the province under his rule. Mr. Hormusji Dadabhoj extolled them for their

style. We are unable to agree in either view. They were all commonplace and absolutely devoid of any original or statesmanlike observation and it is simply absurd to base his Lordship's title to a memorial upon such flimsy grounds. If he made a conciliatory speech at the Town Hall in connection with the out-break of local riots, he made a very unwise, unfair and inexcusable speech about the Poona riots. Bai Putlabai and not Lord Harris deserves the major portion of the credit for the removal of the Lunatic Asylum to a suitable place near Thana.

The Hon. Mr. Fazulbhoy Vishram, whose speeches delivered in the Supreme Legislative council are so lengthy, was scarcely successful in the delivery of the diminutive speech he made at the Town Hall. He was hardly correct in saying that the wealth and intelligence of Bombay were represented at the meeting, unless the Multanees and Marwadees and clerks of Native and European merchants can be said to represent them. Everybody knows what Lord Harris has done for physical education. But in the absence of any other solid achievement it was made to atone for all sins of omission and commission that may fairly be ascribed to the closing administration. The whole aim and object of the bogus memorial movement was made more than manifest in the speeches of the Hon. Mr. Fazulbhoy Visram and the Ven. Archdeacon Goldwyer-Lewis who expressed their desire to see Lord Harris return to India as Viceroy. This was foreseen by us in these columns weeks ago. But the present tomtomming, we are afraid, is destined to end in disappointment. The Hon. Mr. Fazulbhoy Vishram's knowledge of the history of this Presidency cannot be said to be very profound and it is useless to dispute the worth of his estimate that Lord Harris can bear comparison with any of his predecessors. Poor Elphinstone! Poor Lord Reay! Be careful of thy laurels! In these days they are liable to be snatched away at any moment! !

Mr. Moses, whom the *Gazette* called the representative Israelite of the Bombay Presidency, was, we take it, more humorous than serious. The two best and most original reasons he put forward for raising Lord Harris' memorial and with which his Lordship and his admirers must have been intensely pleased were, firstly, that His Excellency presided at the prize distribution of the Israelite School and made a speech, and secondly, that the influence of Lord Harris as a cricketer and sportsman has been so great that even the *Parda ladies* are agitating to have a *gymkhana* of their own. This precious bit of news must have been communicated to the speaker by some Mahatmic agency. When Mahatmas

side with the memorial-walas, inferior mortals must hold peace. We will therefore say nothing about the wonderfully reasoned speech of Mr. Moses but will humbly suggest that his two precious reasons should be specially placarded all throughout the Presidency with a view to increase the memorial fund.

One of the most extraordinary speeches at the meeting was that delivered by Mr. Hormusjee Dadabhoy. We are not surprised to know that the audience showed symptoms of impatience during its delivery. Though as a critic of Lord Harris' style there is a grain of truth in the speaker's perverid observations, Mr. Hormusji's own excited utterance shows abundant traces of tinsel and rhetoric. Whether regarded from the point of view of substance or style we were not at all prepared for the speech he delivered. If it had been true that Lord Harris had never "sought applause," the present one-sided and partisan movement would never have seen the light of day. There is one very serious but mysterious statement which the speaker made and which, it is hoped, he will have the goodness to explain in the interest of the reputation of Lord Reay. "*Soon after his Excellency (Lord Harris) was inducted in his office,*" Mr. Hormusji observed, "*the whole swarm of sycophants, parasites, tale-bearers, self-aggrandisers, all creatures born of corruption and feeding on corruption*" perceived that their occupation was gone. This implied reflection on Lord Reay's administration is the most extraordinary statement that has shocked many readers of this speech. Because it was Lord Reay who cleansed the Augean stables, the growth of nearly 20 years and it was for that among other reasons that the ex-Governor was praised throughout India and yet we are told that all that was the work of Lord Harris. We will not examine some of the empty phrases and platitudes which abounded in the speech. But we may assure Mr. Hormusji that if Lord Harris had really succeeded in rooting out *Khutputists*, *Khutput* would not have succeeded in raising a sum of 45 thousand rupees for his Lordship's memorial and starting a bogus movement. Even judges not actually sitting on the Bench are liable to be swayed in their judgment and Mr. Hormusji's speech is an illustration in point. He seems to have a considerable command over rhetorical English. But we can not give him credit for well knowing Sanskrit or the vernaculars of the Presidency. If he had sufficient acquaintance, he would never have found it difficult to explain "fair play" to 'natives.' He will, we hope, excuse us for telling him that धर्मयुद्ध conveys without "tedious circumlocution" and "round about phrases" the precise notion contained in the expression "fair play." Every Hindu with some acquaintance with

his mythology understands the expression and no governor, however idolized he may be, is needed to impress that notion upon "natives."

One of the puzzling problems in connection with the meeting was the presence of Mr. Dharamsi, Dr. Cowasji, Mr. Tripathi and the Hon. Mr. Justice Ranade. Mr. Dharamsi is one of the most clear-headed Mahomedans in Bombay and from what the public know of him, no explanation of his presence can even be guessed. Dr. Cowasji is too obliging and his speech shows an enthusiastic attempt on his part to apply the choicest complimentary epithets to His Excellency's administration without any attempt whatsoever to reason. We must say the public expected in both the instances a different attitude on their part. But they might have their own reasons and we will not go on speculating on this question. Mr. Tripathi is a political indifferentist, if not a recluse. But inquiries have satisfied us that he did not know even the fact that there was a memorial meeting. But the presence of a crowd attracted him there out of pure curiosity and the eagle-eyed reporters put him down as one of the prominent sympathizers with the movement, as many others have been who were never present. The Hon. Mr. Justice Ranade never was and is not a sympathizer with the movement. But he wanted to have a look at the strange and meagre spectacle presented at the Town Hall and he was placed foremost in the list of those who were present. We are sorry for Mr. Ranade for the position in which he has placed himself. Good many simple minded people went there as sight-seers and thus contributed to increase the audience and why he should have likewise acted is more than we can say. But his ways are sometimes strange. His excessive toleration is well known. Those who know him most intimately are aware that his passive attitude means disapproval. It is notorious that he is not a subscriber. But it is no secret that his presence has been misinterpreted everywhere. For this he alone is responsible.

Dr. Bhandarkar made, as usual, a thundering speech and had of course a fling at native politicians and their "Bombay leader." His was perhaps the only serious attempt at argument. Though even his judgment is not free from distinct traces of bias, he did try to make out, though not quite successfully, that his Lordship's educational policy was on the whole progressive. It must be admitted that Lord Reay left certain questions unsettled. But we are not sure he would not have settled them in the way his successor did. Public opinion had strongly expressed itself against the abolition of the Deccan College and Lord

Harris' advisers certainly acted wisely in deferring to that opinion. With regard to the Fergusson College it was after persistent agitation that Lord Harris yielded and besides it should be remembered Missionary Colleges have received even a more liberal measure of support than the only Native College in this Presidency. The salaries of teachers had to be increased after a good deal of fight with public opinion but several schools have been abolished to carry out this reform. The principle of cheap or free education has been proclaimed in theory. But that means very little until it is given effect to in practice. The speaker forgot to mention that it was Lord Harris' administration that threatened to deprive the University of all subvention. But for the strong expressions of disapproval of the proposed step which were evoked from men like Prof. Oxenham, we feel sure the University would have been deprived of even the miserable sum of Rs. 5,000 to which the government grant has been reduced.

It was, we believe, Mr. Gladstone who said that when ecclesiastics and scientists leave their proper sphere and dabble in politics, they forget their higher principles and degenerate into partizans of the irredeemable type. A striking illustration of this was furnished at the Town Hall memorial meeting by the Ven. Archdeacon Goldwyer Lewis. We have no space to examine the propriety of the extravagant praise he conferred upon Lord Harris. But in the interest of truth and justice which as a conscientious minister of religion, he is bound to safeguard, it is necessary to point out the gross errors into which he has fallen on one or two points and to protest against the unjustifiable language he used in condemnation of the Hon. Mr. Mehta's speech in connection with the Police Amendment Bill. It is a gross misrepresentation to say that Lord Harris has won the admiration of *all* classes in the Presidency. It is also a simple perversion of facts to proclaim that His Excellency, as a great-hearted man, has "*touched the heart of the people.*" When the Rev. gentleman charges the Hon. Mr. Mehta with making *reckless* statements—a charge as unfounded as it was unworthy of the position of the speaker—he should have at least taken the trouble to study carefully what was actually said by the acknowledged and the ablest Parsee representative of the Bombay Presidency in the Supreme Legislative Council. Mr. Goldwyer Lewis informed his audience that he read with "*pain and shame the reckless statements made even in the highest assembly in the land.*" Perhaps he is not aware that the sensible portion of the public have read this '*reckless*' observation with still greater pain and shame and surprise. He-

seems to suggest, a good moralist though he is on his pulpit, that even if Mr. Mehta's statements had been true, he should not have made them in the national interests of India. We had thought that even according to Christian ethics the highest interests of truth could never be incompatible with the best interests of India. Yet Lord Harris' gushing admirers in doing *Puja* to their idol forget relevancy, consistency and even ordinary considerations of fairness and justice.

3rd February 1895.

XII.

We have more than once already admitted the service that Lord Harris has done to this Presidency as a cricketer and sportsman. Whatever the differences of the people with His Excellency in other matters, we believe on this point there are none and we are glad the address presented to his Lordship sums up in a few neat and eloquent sentences the part played by Lord Harris in encouraging the cause of physical education in this Presidency. His Excellency's reply was, as usual, conceived in a friendly and genial spirit. We welcome his protest against cliqueism and exclusiveness in athletics which are nothing, if they do not break social or racial barriers and promote harmony all round. Lord Harris spoke like a genuine sportsman from the bottom of his heart and the enthusiasm and eloquence he put into his speech show what genuine devotion to sport means. We wish Hindoos could catch a little of that fervent sportsman's spirit which pervades the last, of Lord Harris' utterances on physical education and successfully emulate the example of our Parsee friends. Lord Harris in concluding his speech diverged a little into politics and assured the public that he left Bombay without a single uncharitable or unfriendly feeling towards any individual or community. We welcome this generous assurance. Whatever our differences with Lord Harris, we can not allow them to stand in the way of doing our last duty by His Excellency. We bid him our hearty farewell and may be permitted to hope that his Lordship with his Indian experience will not fail to do in England what he can for India and her voiceless people.

10th February 1895.

XIII.

LORD HARRIS' RÉGIME.

In examining the merits of any administration, it is not a safe method to pick out individual acts or measures for commendation. It is not because Lord Ripon or Lord Reay carried out a number of administrative or political reforms that they came to be regarded by the people

with genuine love and admiration. The test applied was what were the marked tendencies of their rule? What beneficent forces did they set in operation? Their righteousness, large sympathy and their high sense of duty and responsibility made a profound impression not only on the people at large but even on the subordinate administrations and departments. A new moral force was infused into them and a high political and administrative ideal placed before all. Such an enlightened policy created self-confidence in the subject people, awakened their political conscience and inspired them with new aspirations and feelings of devotion to British rule. Judged by this criterion what are the achievements of Lord Harris? Officialism has grown more rampant and defiant during the last five years than it was before. Officials first and the people afterwards—that has been the motto of Lord Harris' government. It has treated native public opinion with the utmost indifference, if not contempt. If Lord Reay gave it strength and power by his judicious sympathy with the non-official public, Lord Harris has in spite of himself and through his very blunders imparted to it new force. The native press has received fresh inspiration from Lord Harris' "frankness and straightforwardness" and we are willing to give him whatever credit may be due to him for this journalistic development. As between European and Native interests Lord Harris' Government has been tenderly solicitous about the former at the expense of the latter. It has given the most mischievous predominance to the racial principle. Higher education has received a death-blow under the Provincial Service Scheme which has been condemned everywhere as retrograde and entirely subversive of the good intentions of Sir Richard Temple's government. His Excellency publicly denounced one great community without sufficient justification and led the other to believe that it has the sympathy of the powers that be. The entire tendency of the administration has, on the whole, been of a harmful character and the verdict of impartial history must be that Lord Harris was unequal to the great trust that was confided to him by Her Majesty. In recording this frank estimate we are actuated by no ill-will or grudge against His Excellency, because no honest person can have possibly any against a ruler who has done him no wrong. We are solely guided by broad considerations of great political importance to this country. The sole object of bringing fresh English politicians as Governors and Viceroys is that they should stand out as impartial and sympathetic guardians of the interests of the subject population and infuse a liberal spirit into the bureaucratic administration of India. If this great function cannot be

fulfilled by a Governor or Viceroy, the reasons for bringing fresh administrators from England cease to exist and civilians might as well take their place. Certain measures are of course sanctioned in the usual course of official routine. But they are no marks of statesmanship or high administrative genius. It is unfair to the various departments and their officers not to recognize their services in these matters. Judged therefore, in the light of these weighty considerations Lord Harris' administration must be pronounced to be scarcely better than a blank. No inflated panegyric of the setting sun ought to induce any upright publicist who respects his conscience to pervert contemporary history, and in thus recording our judgment on the closing administration we feel we have honestly done our duty to government and to the people whose interests it is our humble function to advocate and safeguard to the best of our ability.

10th February 1895.

INDU-PRAKASH.

(*ANGLO-VERNACULAR.*)

LORD HARRIS AND HIS ADMIRERS.

I.

A few months ago we sounded a note of alarm that in this Presidency an attempt will be made somewhat on the lines laid down in the collection of subscriptions for the memorial of Lord Lansdowne. We were not alone in publicly protesting against this attempt meant apparently to compel the Native States of this Presidency to subscribe handsomely to a fund to perpetuate the memory of Lord Harris. The temperament of man differs a great deal; and so perhaps his judgment. If there are persons in this Presidency who cannot but feel that their appreciation of the infinite qualities H. E. Lord Harris is endowed with can only be shown by commemorating this august personage in this poor country of ours, we have not the least objection to their doing so. Let those persons who have profited by his 'straightforward and manly intercourse' testify to it according to their means and position. But above all we should at least expect from them that straightforward and manly behaviour which they impute to their hero.

*
* *

This is, indeed, an important question. Public honours should be very sparingly used, and only those persons should be honoured who have proved themselves great men in every sense of the word. What has Lord Harris done to prove himself a great statesman? Except in matters of sport and pastime, Lord Harris has shown very little genius. It would be absurd on our part to deny that he has done good service to 'cricket' in this land. We have repeatedly acknowledged our debt of gratitude to him in this matter. As he will be going away from us, we do not wish to be hard towards a person who has endeavoured to act as the representative of Her Majesty the Queen Empress. But we cannot stifle truth—which is that he has uniformly acted as the representative of the Indian bureaucracy. He works hard, they say. Undoubtedly a good qualification for a Governor. But that is not enough. He is not shrewd enough to see through things. From his official acts and speeches one could see that he is a willing tool in the hands of the executive officers.

What is worse still he has shown very little tact throughout his long rule of five years.

*
* *

Yes, his Lordship is straightforward and manly. We have only to quote an instance to prove these qualities, viz., his treatment of the Deccanis. He was straightforward in abusing them and manly in bullying them. He declared that he loved the rugged hills and plains of the Deccan, and honoured the people who went to welcome him by telling them that they are wanting in common sense. This is only one instance, we can quote several. But in this land of toadies and flatterers it is not surprising that there should be found persons in Bombay who would come forward to raise a permanent memorial to Lord Harris.

*
* *

These persons would like to have a public memorial, and they know that the best way of success lies in enlisting the sympathy and co-operation of the Natives Princes. With this object a circular is sent round to the princes asking for their support and patronage. Is it strange then that the Princes of Kathiawar have come forward with large subscriptions? The Maharaja of Bhavnagar has contributed Rs. 5,000 and several other States Rs. 1,000 each: while, minor States contribute sums varying from Rs. 400 to Rs. 500. When they secure the money from the Princes, the promoters of the memorial are going to have a public meeting. The Town Hall of course will be at the disposal of the committee, and resolutions will be passed highly commending the *regime* of our sporting Governor and declaring that a memorial is required in the public interest and so on. Men favoured at drawing rooms, ambitious persons hankering after Rao Bahadurs, Khanbahadurs and C. I. E.'s and C. S. I.'s, high officials seeking for higher appointments still, Native Princes subscribing because they cannot do otherwise, will form the august company at the meeting. The public may fill the body of the hall out of sheer curiosity to see how the show will be conducted. But very little money can be got out of the general public. The promoters, however, do not expect the public to pay nor will they try to swell the fund by emptying their pockets instead of their brains.

*
* *

These sponsors and godfathers of the Harris memorial will only create a feeling of disgust in the minds of the general public for their pet-child. These persons are not really the true friends of His

Excellency; for, nothing that has been done by His Excellency himself, not even the most trenchant criticism of his opponents will be more ruinous to the reputation of Lord Harris as a statesman than this injudicious and unpopular attempt of his zealous and interested admirers to force his presence permanently on the Bombay public. We hope for his Lordship's sake that he will dissuade his maladroit worshippers from making themselves ridiculous in the eyes of the public. For in their attempt to get cheap notoriety these persons, no doubt with very good intentions towards his Lordship, are sure to bring discredit on His Excellency the Governor himself.

25th November 1894.

II.

MEMORIAL TO LORD HARRIS AND THE KOLHAPUR STATE.

We hear that His Highness the Maharaja of Kolhapur is going to subscribe Rs. 15,000 to the Fund of the Lord Harris Memorial. We have got nothing to say against his giving away so large a sum. His Highness is under obligations to Lord Harris, and it would be both ungrateful and ungraceful on his part to have refused to accede to the demand made upon him. But we would like to make a suggestion which we hope H. H. the Maharaja will see his way to adopt. If, instead of subscribing the sum to the general fund of the Memorial, he spends it in establishing some useful institution as a Memorial to Lord Harris in his own State for the benefit of his subjects, it will undoubtedly serve a double purpose. He will have shown his gratitude to and his admiration for Lord Harris and at the same time he will have entitled himself to the gratitude of his people for the good done to them. If Lord Harris' memory ought to remain, green anywhere in this Presidency, Kolhapur is certainly not the last place. If such a proposal as we have suggested above be placed before the promoters of the Memorial Fund, they will not, we think, take it amiss. The Fund bids fair to be a grand one, as there is no lack of zealous workers, and we do not suppose they will miss much the sum of Rs. 15,000. We therefore earnestly hope that the money will be utilised on some useful object in the Kolhapur State itself.

10th December 1894.

III.

PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT TO LORD
HARRIS AS A SPORTSMAN.

We must confess we are inclined to side with Dr. Bahadurji than with other admirers of Lord Harris as a sportsman. That he has given impetus to sports generally and to cricket particularly no one can deny. That sporting men and others who like to see our youths participate in outdoor exercise should entertain His Excellency is extremely desirable. But to make the entertainment a public one is to give it a character which many persons will not like to see it invested with. What does it mean in fact ? It means that we are going to create a public memorial to a Governor whose administration is only known for giving encouragement to sport. No one will like to see the Indian administration : of any Governor made conspicuous for its encouragement of sport alone. By giving Lord Harris a public entertaining and a public memorial we emphasise that portion of his administration by making it of a private character we keep it in its proper place. That is what Dr. Bahadurji urges, and we think he is entirely in the right in the stand he has made on behalf of the general public.

14th January 1895.

IV.

THE MEMORIAL ANALYSED.

The friends of Lord Harris are doing a very doubtful service to him. These friends have determined to bring the name of His Excellency into ridicule. It seems as if their efforts are the result of a well planned conspiracy to rouse the indignation of the public—which as a rule is indulgent to its Governors—against Lord Harris in person. We have reason to believe that H. E. Lord Harris is himself against a memorial. And indeed, it is not strange. Officials may bring him round to their view by representing to him matters as they like ; but so far as popular feeling is concerned they cannot deceive him. Even a statue raised to his memory with money chiefly subscribed by princes will not carry conviction to his mind that he is a popular Governor. A year ago nobody would have dreamt that a memorial would be raised to the memory of Lord Harris. Six months ago such an idea was gently whispered. The

idea was too monstrous to be true. We raised our voice at the time along with several of our contemporaries against the secret attempts to raise subscriptions for a public memorial. The public did not care for a monument to perpetuate the barren administration of an unsympathetic ruler. And had his so called friends been sensible enough, they would have dropped the idea at once.

But they did not take this course. There are always to be found in Indian society, men who will raise memorials to anybody, men hankering after honours and emoluments and wishing to be in the good graces of high persons. In Bombay we have plenty of them. They are to be found everywhere; they are the black sheep of every community—Europeans, Hindus, Mahomedans and Parsees; perhaps in larger numbers in the last named community. Now, these people are to be seen everywhere; they attend Government parties, and if rich themselves give parties to Government officers. This is what the Hon'ble Mr. H. J. S. Cotton of the Bengal Civil Service says about them: "They are wealthy native gentlemen who court the company of officials, and do not scruple to dispose of their native guests with scant ceremony, while they reserve the grandest display, the richest luxuries, and the choicest amusements for the delectation of their European guests." Their sole ambition is to get the favour of high officials, and the highest object of their life is to get a Rao or Khan Bahadurship, a Companionship of the Indian Empire or a Knighthood or Baronetcy. Some of these people convened a council of their comrades, and started the idea of a Harris Memorial. To give these men their due, we must say they are generally familiar with the material they have to work with. This is the way they generally look for ways and means: The first source to be tapped is the Native Princes, poor dependent Sovereigns whose will is subordinate to that of the Political Agent in their own territories. In every movement started by officials or on behalf of officials which requires money for its development the Princes are supposed to subscribe; and they have to submit to these demands whether they like them or not. When the fattened calf of the Princes is procured, the organiser wants a popular hero to be the officiating priest for the sacrifice. If they can get a man of light and leading to bless the offering given by the princes, well and good. He then offers the victim with fulsome prayers to the god, the victim is accepted, the sacrifice is complete, the god is appeased, and a new deity is created in India for public worship. At the termination of the career of every Governor—be he good, bad or indifferent—an image is raised to

his memory, and Bombay thoroughfares and public buildings are adorned with busts and statues! The public itself enters into the spirit of the plan and after a respectable lapse of time worships a statue of the Queen—as they did in Madras—or blackens the statue of Sir Richard Temple—as they did in Bombay. In fact, these statues add to the vast army of the demons and gods of the Hindu Pantheon. Indeed, it has become a serious question which the Christian Missionaries ought to solve; and if they earnestly desire that the Hindu should leave off worshipping his numerous gods and begin worshipping their three Gods, they should be the first persons to oppose memorials to Governors and Governors-General.

The time, however, is gone by when India can vote memorials to each and every Governor without discrimination. Money may be collected still for any purpose; but promoters of private memorials can hardly invest their memorials with a public character. Their attempts are bound to fail; the thinking public will rise against such proposals, the public press which gives voice to popular feeling will expose them to the public view, divest them of false colours and paint them in true ones. If our readers have followed the history of the present memorial from its inception down to its present stage of development, they will at once see that the memorial can never have a public character. The whole Indian press has raised its voice against it, men of light and leading in Indian society have held themselves aloof from it, sensible Englishmen have not subscribed to it, and many of those who have subscribed have probably done so under the impression that it is to be a private memorial.

Let us, now, examine the subscription list, for it will throw a flood of light on the sources from which the fund is drawn. We will divide the sources into four parts viz. Princes, Parsees, Europeans, and the rest. The fund, at present, amounts to more than Rs. 25,000. Out of these nearly Rs. 19,000 are paid by the Princes; more than 3,000 by Parsees, a little over 2,600 by Europeans, and the remainder which is about Rs. 600 by the rest i. e., Hindus, Mahomedans and other races of India. By far the largest portion of the subscriptions comes from the Native Princes. The Parsees come next with more than Rs. 3,000. Out of this the Petit family subscribes about one third, their aggregate share amounting to Rs. 1,080. The Europeans, as is natural enough, are the next best subscribers, their total subscriptions amounting to Rs. 2615. Mr. Campbell heads the list with Rs. 300; Messrs. Acworth and Cotton are bracketed together with Rs. 200 each. Hindus and Mahomedans, who form the largest portion of the population of the city and indeed

of the whole Presidency, so their appreciation by subscribing a sum just over Rs. 600. But if we except from this list Runchodlal Chotalal and Harkissandas Narotandas, who have subscribed Rs. 200 and 100 respectively, the sum is reduced to half its dimensions. Out of a sum of Rs. 25,000, Hindus and Mahomedans subscribing a little over Rs. 300 excepting of course the two men just mentioned ! Does this not throw a flood of light on the popularity of the Governor among the two most important races in India ? Some people might object: "Oh ! This is a sum subscribed by friends and admirers." Be it so. Why should then these friends and admirers come before the public and have the proceedings printed in the daily papers ? Why should they have the Town Hall for a meeting which is to consist only of friends and admirers ? These tactics must be exposed. The last meeting was a meeting of friends and admirers. Still in the dailies it becomes "a large meeting of representative European and Native inhabitants of Bombay." We all know that meetings of friends and admirers in course of time develop into public meetings : they are advertised as meetings of friends, admirers, sympathisers and so on ; but when the reports of these meetings reach the printing offices of Anglo-Indian papers they become public meetings. It is a common trick ; but we warn the public of Bombay beforehand that they should not allow the organisers of the meeting to call a meeting which, after the due process of incubation, turns into a public meeting. There is a simple method of stopping these tricks. We suppose the majority of the public will go to the meeting. We hope the leaders of the Indian public opinion will also be present there. There is no reason why they should not go there ; we have no doubt they are friends of Lord Harris, though they may not be his admirers ; most of them are even his admirers in his capacity as a cricketer. They should, therefore, go to the meeting, and give vent to their views. The public will support them at the meeting. The duty of a friend is to save the reputation of his friend when it is in danger. Now, these so called friends and admirers are simply putting his Lordship into a false position. They undoubtedly intend to raise a public memorial to Lord Harris, but by so doing they simply make his Lordship more unpopular. The duty of our political leaders should be to see that a representative of our Queen Empress is not lowered in public estimation. An attempt, nay, a well-organised conspiracy is hatched to make the name of Lord Harris unpopular in the land. Let us try to rescue his Lordship, save him from his gushing friends and false admirers, men who do not like to do justice to his administrative capacities.

Indeed, Bombay must protest against these reckless attempts. Is it not an insult to the public of Bombay that certain busy bodies, in spite of its protests given in the plainest terms, should palm off a memorial to an unpopular Governor as a public one, and when the funds are realised to erect a statue as a standing monument of the folly and weakness of its citizens? And it must also be borne in mind that besides serving Lord Harris we have a duty to perform; we have to be true to ourselves. Let Bombay speak in unmistakable terms that it will not raise a memorial to perpetuate the memory of a Governor who has never risen superior to official prejudices, and whose term of office has not been marked by a single act of true statesmanship.

21st January, 1895.

V.

Lord Harris Memorial meeting at Khan Bahadur Dorabjee's house in Poona was not of representatives of any community as stated in the telegrams, to the dailies. It has been ascertained from those who invited and attended the meeting that the invitation was by private circular and of these about fifteen gentlemen especially invited attended.

*
* *

A propos of the testimonial which the admirer, friends, toadies and flunkies of Lord Harris are going to raise, a letter has opportunely appeared in the *Times* (London) which deserves though tful perusal by the testimonial-mad folks of Bombay. The arguments there advanced are equally cogent in Bombay. A "Private Secretary" writes as follows:—

THE TESTIMONIAL NUISANCE.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,—Is it not time that some public protest was made by means of some powerful organ like the *Times* against the ever-increasing tax and nuisance of testimonials? No one nowadays can occupy a post efficiently from a mayoralty to a curacy, without having a testimonial presented to him for having after all only done his duty. I object to them as a nuisance and a heavy tax on the following grounds:—

1. A letter asking for subscriptions towards a testimonial to a personal friend is absolutely the hardest form of begging letter to refuse for many obvious reasons.
2. Objects really deserving of support must of necessity suffer from these constant drains on the pockets of public men.

3. It has become almost an evidence of failure in office if a man is not presented with a testimonial.

4. England still, as in the days of Nelson, "expects every man to do his duty," and surely ought not to be so surprised and pleased at his doing so, as to want to give him a testimonial for it.

Some men positively delight in getting up a testimonial, but if they only knew with what bad grace most people subscribe, I feel sure, they would be more careful in future. In these days of hard times and constant appeals for really worthy objects men do not want to give to these useless testimonials, and yet they cannot help themselves.

If you, sir, would consent to open your columns and ventilate this grievance, I am convinced that an overwhelming expression of opinion would at once minimise this intolerable and growing nuisance.

I am yours faithfully,
Private Secretary.

21st January 1895.

VI.

RECENT UNIVERSITY EVENTS.

To the Editor of the Indu-Prakash.

Sir.

The University incident of Monday before last raises some very important questions affecting not only the dignity but the very constitution of the University, and I trust, you will allow me space in your valued journal. The subject may be considered under three heads.—1st Some points regarding the rules of conduct of business; 2nd. The question of special addresses to the Senate; 3rd. Has the Chancellor or the Vice-Chancellor the right to appoint special Convocation days, *i. e.* call special Convocation meetings of the Senate, *i. e.*, meetings for conferring degrees, for the purpose of giving addresses whenever it should be the pleasure of or convenient to, either the Chancellor or the Vice-Chancellor to do so?

Of late there have been many sad exhibitions of the University Senate rules for the convening and conduct of Senate Meetings, but the exhibition of Monday before last has beaten all previous displays. The Vice-Chancellor and his coadjutors of the Syndicate, distinguished members of the various Faculties—including that of Law, after mature consideration, of the statutes affecting the constitution of the University

made a referendum to the Senate asking them if it be their wish to alter their *annual Convocation date* just for this year; i. e., to abrogate for the time being one of their by-laws, to enable their Chancellor to deliver an address to them. It soon became known that a tolerably fair number of the Senate believed that no sufficient cause was shown for the granting of the supplication, and that opposition would be offered in the Senate meeting of Monday before last. Attempts were made from the highest quarters to *sumjao* the opposition but in vain. It is said that the opposition were in a minority. All the same it was plain that the simple fear of a discussion on the subject of the supplication had driven the pro-address and graceful party to methods which were neither dignified nor in accordance with the prescribed rules for the conduct of Senate meetings. It was certainly no dignified procedure to call the Senate together for a *special* purpose and then abruptly to dismiss them without even the courtesy of a reason for the abrupt treatment—such is grace as understood by the graceful and courteous party: It was very like a village Puntooji suddenly dismissing his little school-children with—Go home my boys, I don't want you to-day,—perhaps because he was confused or the little worm in his inside had given a sudden turn! It was neither dignified nor in accordance with rules for the mover of a proposition to be present and to rise only to say. "I decline to move my proposition"; and the Vice-Chancellor certainly exceeded his powers when without consulting the wish of the meeting if the proposer be allowed permission to withdraw his motion or giving a moment's time to the meeting, he was on his legs, the instant the mover sat down, to dissolve the meeting with 'express' haste. The recognised procedure is that a proposition drops, if the mover be absent and nobody takes it up for him. Should the mover be present, the rules require that he should withdraw from the meeting should he desire his proposition not to be put; and this was the procedure that had to be carried out, under similar circumstances not many weeks ago. It would seem as if the precipitate and irregular retreat was previously and purposely arranged to escape every possibility of uncomfortable discussion and dissent.

The University is concerned with higher Education. It has no direct connection with primary or even *physical* Education. Addresses to the senate have of late been mere personal defences or apologies or attacks in matters of social and socio-political concern; and it was time the senate set its face against all such attempts to utilize the function of a convocation for the purposes of reading lectures on matters far removed from

if not altogether unconnected with, the subject of liberal or higher Education. Addresses on Education from acknowledged educationalists of repute would, no doubt, be welcome, but even such addresses however much it be desired to have them delivered before a Senate meeting cannot be inflicted on the Senate without their permission, by any distorted and irregular interpretation of the rules of the Senate regarding the powers of the Vice-Chancellor. It is said, H. E. Lord Harris who has had in his personal keeping the Education-portfolio has matured some views on Education, which would be worth knowing. But, surely, if it be special views on Education only that are desired to be made known which method or channel could be more appropriate and more effectual for the purpose than that of a Minute by H. E. on Education, a method by which the educational machinery could be most easily and effectively put into motion for the purpose of making the matured views fructify? Much stress has been laid on what is called courtesy and grace. But surely the University is no place for friends and admirers to make much less insist upon making their courtesy to the object of their worship, for in the Temple of Knowledge all goes by merit tested by hard and strict tests without distinction not only of caste, colour or creed but also of personal position social or otherwise. *Jo hookum* courtesy, which is but a species of dignified servility cannot be allowed any place in the consideration of University matters.

Has the Vice-Chancellor the right that he is said to claim for himself—viz., to hold special Convocations—simply for the purpose of presenting addresses to the Senate? The University constitution prescribes a sequence of events. It is laid down that every year examinations should be held, their results declared according to prescribed rules, degrees conferred on the successful candidates by the Chancellor or the Vice-Chancellor at a special meeting of the Senate convened for the purpose of conferring degrees—called the *annual* Convocation; and that this *annual* convocation *shall* be held on a fixed day. This day was altered by the Senate—who alone can alter it—only last year and fixed for the third Monday in February. This is the general sequence of events for each year prescribed by the Constitution of the University. It may be that owing to circumstances some of the candidates declared eligible for degrees may not be able to present themselves for their diplomas or certificates on the annual Convocation day, or that some special degree is to be conferred on some distinguished individual. To meet these contingencies—and to meet these *natural* contingencies only—namely of conferring ordinary degrees on such graduates as

had unavoidably absented themselves on the annual Convocation day, or of conferring special or extraordinary degrees in special cases—a proviso is added to rule 36—saying the Chancellor or Vice-Chancellor shall convene a Convocation, i. e., a special meeting of the Senate for the conferring of degrees—on such other days besides the fixed day for the annual Convocation as he may decide. Only last November i. e. *after the fixed* Convocation day several graduates were so admitted to their degrees. In the case of a social degree it may be that the degree may be conferred at any time of the year—even before the annual Convocation—for such degree has no reference to the sequence of events prescribed by the Constitution viz. the holding of examinations, declaring of results—admission to degrees on the Convocation day fixed by the Senate. Thus, then, By-law 36 liberally and naturally construed means only that every year after the preliminary functions of University examinations and declarations of results are over, the graduates of the year shall be admitted to their degrees at a special meeting of the Senate convened for the purpose of conferring degrees and called the annual Convocation and that this annual convocation shall be held on the fixed day of third Monday in February; and that the Chancellor or the Vice-Chancellor may appoint other graduation days, i. e., days for conferring degrees to meet two natural contingencies, namely, (1) of cases in which special degrees have to be conferred—a contingency that may arise and be met at any time, irrespective of the annual Convocation day, (2) cases in which graduates were unavoidably absent on the annual Convocation day—a contingency that may and can only arise and be met *after* the annual Convocation day. Now what is proposed to be done is this: Since it is the Senate alone that can alter their annual Convocation day, that date is to be let alone and the annual Convocation is to be held on the day fixed by the By-laws of the University, namely, third Monday in February at which most of the graduates will be admitted to their degrees. But by virtue of the right of the Vice-Chancellor to appoint other graduation days besides the annual Convocation day a special Convocation is proposed to be called on the 12th of February at which some of the graduates are to be admitted to their degrees. Surely there is no warrant whatever for calling this special Convocation or appointing this other graduation day for it can be done only for the purpose of conferring special degrees or admitting to their degrees such graduates as were unable to attend on the annual Convocation. What warrant is there, again, for the Vice-

Chancellor to allow admission to their degrees to a few graduates only at this special Convocation? How could he refuse if *all* the graduates claimed to be admitted to the degrees at this special or extra Convocation? And if it were to be that all the graduates got their degrees at this extra Convocation, there could be then no annual Convocation, which would again be a distinct violation of the by-law. But what is the intention of the strange procedure to be adopted? Is this extra Convocation convened for the purpose of conferring degrees under any of the condition to which the proviso in by-law 36 applies? No, The Vice-Chancellor, at the dictation of the Chancellor, to whom and not to the Senate he owes his appointment and whom he feels bound to serve calls this special or extra Convocation, not for the purpose of conferring degrees on graduates of this year who by law will claim admission on the annual Convocation day, on the 18th of February, nor for the purpose of conferring any special degree—for there has been no such proposal before the University—but for the purpose of a Convocation Address by his master the Chancellor! A Convocation address is no prescribed function of the University. It is only part of a customary show at the special meeting of the Senate to which the public are admitted. To misplace a prescribed function of the University, to make room for a thing which is only allowed by custom on particular occasions is to overstep all bounds of fairness, justice, and rights,—to smother all principles and conscience to meet the demands of grace and courtesy which prescribe the making of curtsy to highly placed objects—to play fast and loose with University by-laws and to reduce its grave functions to a mockery and farce. If special or extra Convocations are thus to be called for the purposes of Convocation address by the Chancellor or the Vice-Chancellor whenever it may be the desire of one or either of them to speak out some views that are said to be matured, just by picking out a few graduates of the year for conferring degrees on some other graduation day than the one fixed by law, *i. e.* by contriving to bring about graduation days, what is there to prevent either the Chancellor or the Vice-Chancellor—in fact one has to tell the other to do it—give 365 Convocation addresses by just appointing 364 other graduation days besides the one day in the year fixed by law, simply by calling up a graduate each day of the year for admission to his degree? It is awful to think that even the sanctity and fairness of Universities are so easily invaded in India by private arrangements overriding all laws, justice and even decency.

VII.

The friends and admirers of Lord Harris met in the Town Hall to sing the praises of the departing Governor, and to show to the world at large that the first city in the Empire contains a goodly number of toadies and flunkies among its citizens. A few rich merchants resplendent with past honours and entertaining a lively feeling of favours to come, and good many busybodies well known in Bombay Society filled the platform, while the body of the hall was crowded by Marwarees and Multanees, most of them innocent of the English language. The Police were there in full force with the detective department in the front. Why such precautions were necessary we cannot tell, for surely the friends and admirers of a Governor cannot be suspected of uttering treason in the Town Hall. The proceedings were extremely dull, the speeches showed traces of elaborate preparation but failed to catch the attention of the audience. A speaker reviewing the career of Lord Harris had to ransack all the administration reports to find the good points in the administration, and even then he had to rely on small details to show the innate statesmanship of His Excellency. The European element was small, which goes to prove that they considered the meeting a bore. The native admirers did not get sick of speech-making. One of these orators who posed forth as knowing the intention of Lord Harris as to what form the memorial should take was properly snubbed by His Excellency in the speech he made to the immortal deputations. This will enhance his Lordship's value in the eyes of his admirers, for they will consider it an additional boon conferred by Lord Harris. This will bring him more admirers still. At present the number of admirers is 399, and their collective offerings come to Rs 40,267. Judging from the number of admirers and the bulk of subscriptions one must consider Lord Harris to be the most popular Governor that has ever come to rule Bombay !

4th February 1895.

VIII.

The following was circulated broadcast in Bombay on the day of the meeting of the friends and admirers of Lord Harris in the Town Hall:—

LAY OF A DEPARTING DEITY.

Pray, Citizens of Bombay, listen ere I bid farewell,
 To my tale of joy and woe, I'm just about to tell.
 I hail from the shire of 'Cant,' a Knight of the field was I,
 When one fine morning I heard some one whisper, "My Lord would you
 a Governorship try?"

Why not? I said to myself, I have capacity and 'common sense' too,
 If I a bat could nicely wield, why not a governorship too.

Soon I my 'cricket book' closed (') and off at my sovereign's behest,
 Rushed on to rule over you, with what result you know best.

Some my administration condemn, others call me "exalted mediocrity,"
 Sure, if such be my reward, I must say 'bye bye' to your city.

But ere this d—d city I leave, let me thank you my admirers all
 For the Memorial you have raised to my 'manly intercourse' and for
 your success at the 'Hall.'

Now friends, address-grinders and all do for the sake of my comfort,
 Pay cash and try to assist, Messrs. Pendulum, Cotton and Beaufort.
 From office to office send round your list, and coax clerkdom to subscribe,
 Never mind if people at large show scant courtesy, and treat me with
 jeer and ribe.

A few more days, a few more nights, and I'll be out of sight,
 But your flattery in vain won't be, if you'll put down your mite.

A Fellowship or J. P. ship still on you I can bestow,
 So see that when the hat goes round, you do not answer 'no.'

4th February 1895.

VIII.

"THE DEPARTING DEITY."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE INDU-PRAKASH.

Sir,—I am an admirer of Lord Harris. He has done great service to
 the Presidency. He has taught many men to play cricket in style. He has
 by his admirable command over this noble game, persuaded numbers of
 people to take part in it. The enthusiasm with which the cricket matches
 are watched nowadays was surely never witnessed in this Presidency
 before. His skill in all the branches of the game have already
 been done justice to by the best of critics in this department.
 That he towered above all in this part of India in handling the
 willow passes as gospel truth. His Lordship deserves credit for
 having successfully arranged the cricket matches of absorbing

interest. Bombay and Poona poured forth their public to the cricket fields. Every one of the crowd thanked his Lordship for the entertainment and admired his ability in getting up this great show. This is by far the greatest event during His Lordship's regime. And when one just thinks of the fact that this was not even referred to in the "grand" memorial meeting, one is filled with unutterable contempt for the ignorance of those who were closely packed in the Hall. When the deputation waited on him Lord Harris must have been all wrath inwardly for this inexcusable omission. The speakers simply went out of their way to praise his Lordship for things which he never laid any claim to or which he never did dream of. Lord Harris (fortunately or unfortunately for ourselves) never liked to be "jack of all trades." He well knew the saying "What is worth doing is worth doing well." He knew as well that there were several things worth doing. He was also aware that "he was not well enough for Bombay." But he had already made up his mind to be the ruler of Bombay. All these things naturally led him to the conclusion that he should catch hold of one thing and do it well. In fact he contributed his mite. He did "his best." Perhaps unfortunately "his best" consisted simply in giving a rapid move to the cause of physical education. And this he did with so thorough a conscientiousness and with so unremitting a zeal that whenever and wherever anything was done in this respect, somehow or other he always managed to be present. He opened a number of institutions for the promotion of athletics and each time uttered the same words of wisdom with a characteristic outspokenness.

Cricket was not the only department where His Excellency worked. He was active all round among his boon companions. In chase too he was an expert. In fact Lord Harris had much to do by way of encouraging the love of sports among the natives. The English officials too had grown dull during Lord Reay's regime. This would have grown to an alarming extent had not Lord Harris and his loving consort, who is by the way "dignity incarnate," come to the rescue. It was necessary to breathe some life into the men who surrounded His Excellency and consequently His Excellency's "gentlemanliness" was ever ready to entertain at the Government House the sportive and the gay. This also escaped the notice of the friends and admirers of Lord Harris.

One could very easily have seen that these already too numerous engagements could not possibly have left any time for His Excellency to attend to the trifles in the Council Hall. The inconsiderate members of Council constantly kept teasing his Lordship while the sound of the

cheers of the spectators of the cricket match "Parsees vs. Presidency" was every moment making him impatient. His Lordship had so many engagements out-of-doors during the day and in the ball room during the night that he very wisely left all the official matters to his subordinates who knew their business better owing to their long experience. This prudent step also passes unnoticed. It is no use adding more instances'. The omission of those already stated are enough to drive one mad.

Lord Harris must have felt this himself. It is evident from his reply to the deputation that he did not like what was said about him in the meeting. Thus in order politely to lengthen his speech he devotes the greater part of it to his wife and son.

As an admirer of Lord Harris I was certainly disappointed by the proceedings of last Tuesday's meeting. I am led to believe that the so-called friends and admirers of Lord Harris who got up so large a *tamasha* at the Town Hall last week were no real admirers at all. They found no words too high sounding to praise His Excellency's doings and policy in all the departments. But even a caricature must have some ground for its basis. His Excellency has himself proclaimed his love of truth. Their attempt at flattering, therefore, would not pass unnoticed. His Lordship will certainly perceive the difference between real attachment and servile adulation. I must, therefore conclude that the meeting in the Town Hall was a bogus meeting. Indeed what can marwarrees and merchants know of Lord Harris? They never went to see cricket, and had therefore no opportunities to admire him. These folks are admirers of every Governor without discrimination. It is their nature to worship blindly any one who is sent to rule over them. Sir, I indignantly protest against this gentry classing themselves friends and admirers of Lord Harris. It is to lay bare the unreality of the meeting of the so called friends and admirers and to set forth the real merits of Lord Harris that I have encroached on your valuable columns.

A REAL ADMIRER.

4th February 1895.

PRABHAKAR.

(*ANGLO-VERNACULAR*)

I

THE PROPOSED HARRIS MEMORIAL.

After all, the friends and admirers of our retiring Governor have been able to raise a pretty large sum for the purpose of a memorial in honour of His Excellency. Already a sum of over Rupees 25,000 has been subscribed and further subscriptions may be expected to soon flow in. Altogether, the movement promises to be a success. Without entering into the question whether His Excellency's *regime* during the past five years has been such as to deserve a public honour, we fail to see why his friends and admirers should not honour him in any manner they like. While opinions have differed about some of his political acts—and we for our part think that Lord Harris hopelessly blundered on those occasions on which one would have expected him to show better tact and keener foresight—there 'is a general consensus of opinion that His Lordship deserves to be honoured for his many personal qualities of the head and heart. Himself a keen sportsman, Lord Harris did his best to encourage among us those manly games which are as calculated for our well-being as any official acts of kindness, seeing that we are as a people backward in physical education. It is true that he has not displayed any great abilities characteristic of a true statesman. His reign showed a lamentable want of sympathy with the people, for which, however, the blame does not rest so much with His Excellency as with those by whose advice he allowed himself to be guided in his official career.

19th January 1895.

II

THE HARRIS MEMORIAL.

The meeting that was held last week in Poona to take steps to raise a memorial to our retiring Governor turns out to be after all a meeting of friends and admirers only, numbering about fifteen gentlemen, and that it in no way possessed that character which, it was attempted by the correspondent of our English dailies to invest it with. Of course, we

have never questioned the right of His Excellency's friends and admirers to honour him in any way they please, and, indeed, we are glad that they have bestirred themselves so energetically and have so far met with a fair amount of success. But we think that it was a mistake on the part of those who tried to give the movement a public character, and Lord Harris himself could not have failed by this time to see what claims he has on the gratitude of the community as a whole. But of all parts of the Presidency His Excellency can least expect to be honoured by the people of the Deccan, who have more than any others suffered by the policy followed by Lord Harris's Government. The uncalled for rebuke which His Lordship administered to the people of the Deccan during his recent tour, and his total disregard to public opinion in many important matters affecting the welfare of the people, have to a large degree tended to alienate the sympathies of the public from a movement, which would otherwise have met with cordial support from them. We think the few gentlemen that met last week at Khan Bahadur Dorabjee Pudumjee's would have done well not to hold the meeting at all, or at least not to allow the proceedings to be so misrepresented as to invite comment in the public press. Of course they could have signified their intention of honouring Lord Harris by joining the Bombay meeting, or by subscribing direct to the Bombay fund without holding a separate meeting at Poona. We are glad that yesterday's meeting in the Town Hall of the friends and admirers of His Excellency was fairly well attended, and the movement supported as it is by men of wealth and position promises to be a success. We repeat we are not hostile to honour His Excellency in a suitable manner, but we only say that it would be a mistake to try to invest it with a public character.

30th January 1895.

III

TUESDAY'S MEETING IN THE TOWN HALL.

The friends and admirers of Lord Harris have, as we have already observed, every right to hold a meeting and to do in a sensible manner what they think would show him their sense of gratitude and respect, and we are glad that the meeting, that was held for the purpose on Tuesday last in the Town Hall, was quite to their satisfaction. It was nothing more or less than what such a meeting should be. Keeping the fact in mind that His Lordship was praised for his certain personal qualities and that the sphere of his personal favour and kindness

must be necessarily very limited, it may be said that the meeting was certainly better attended than its promoters could have expected. Nothing can be more foolish, however, than to suppose that it bore a public character. Even the best of its promoters had no such idea in their minds. Dr. Bhaudarkar, who has been so much charmed with His Excellency's straight and open ways of gentlemanly behaviour, spoke only the truth, when he said:—"This is a meeting of the friends and admirers of Lord Harris." Both the local English papers that greet us daily in the morning gave however, quite a different version. Indeed we may say they have done a mistake inasmuch as they have given their readers to understand that the meeting in question was a public one, representative of all castes and communities that constitutes this vast city. Those who attempt to invest a thing with a character which it never possessed, nor even claimed, do double mischief. They injure the cause they thus intend to serve, by lowering it in the estimation of the people, while they hurt the best of feelings, creating at the same time in many a noble mind an honest indignation at such a mean conduct. The fact is that the meeting was not a public one nor can it be said to be representative in any sense. The usual speakers and representatives of the people at large were not to be seen and there was to be noticed the total absence of enthusiasm and warmth that generally characterise such meetings when they are the outcome of spontaneous growth of public feeling.

2nd February 1895.

SUBODHA PRAKASH.

(ANGLO-VERNACULAR)

I

We have often heard great complaints about the misrepresentations and false pretences resorted to by persons asking help from others. The letter of Messrs. A. F. Beaufort, and N. N. Wadia which we extract *in extenso* from the *Gujarati*, shows that begging has a baneful effect even on men of light and leading. We have more than once approved of a memorial being raised by the personal admirers of His Excellency. But nothing can justify such gross misrepresentation as is contained in para. 2, of the letter. We await with great interest what His Excellency has to say as regards this letter.

II

The rumour that was afloat as to the attempt of the officials and other admirers of Lord Harris to collect subscriptions for the perpetuation of the memory of His Excellency has assumed a more definite form in the shape of a list of the subscribers, at the head of which stands the name of the Maharaja of Bhownugger with Rupees 5,000 marked against it. As we said before, there could be no objection to the collection of subscriptions among his personal friends and others who may have appreciated his preeminently social and genial nature. But what calls for remark is the peculiarity of the subscription list that all the names in it are those of the princes who were and are more or less under his clutches. If it is not illegal, it is certainly most reprehensible that blackmail should be levied on these unfortunates simply because they have not stuff in them to resist the importunities of those who, in their eyes, seem to rule over their destinies.

21st November 1894.

III

The discussion that has been carried on in the Press as to a memorial for Lord Harris has not been fruitless. His admirers have been compelled to put forward his claims in the only reasonable way possible. An Evening entertainment is to be given him and a presentation shield bearing His Excellency's name, in recognition of the great encouragement he has afforded to physical education in this country." Certainly no

one can take exception to this with good reason. As has been more than once observed in these columns, Lord Harris is essentially a good man, whose very frank nature led him to commit such serious blunders in his Administration, by the indiscriminate adoption of the views of the officers of the stamp of Mr. Lee-Warner. Therefore whatever objections we may have to honor him as a successful Governor, the present proposal has our hearty sympathy and we have no doubt it will be a success.

Wednesday, 9th January 1895.

IV

Now that the time of His Excellency the Governor's departure is fast approaching his admirers have put forth all their energy to expedite the collection of funds for raising a memorial to commemorate his connection with this Presidency. The members of the Bar and others have been approached with a request over the signature of Mr. Beaufort and a meeting has been called "to discuss and resolve upon the steps to be taken to raise the memorial," by Messrs. H. A. Acworth, Hasunbhoj Vishram, George Cotton, Harkisondas Narotandas, A. F. Beaufort and Nowroji N. Wadia. This meeting which was, by the notice, to be held in the Municipal Hall has been transferred to the rooms of the Chamber of Commerce, owing to the objection of a number of Corporators to the use of the Hall for this purpose. With all this opposition, considering the position of the persons who have undertaken this movement, and the want of back-bone, which characterises our wealthy class particularly when confronted with *Bada Sahibs*, there is no doubt of something being done. Parsis as a class have joined the movement as they have always had special consideration at the hands of His Excellency. But none of our popular leaders have done so. Whatever the tablet on the proposed memorial may say, it will when erected, witness as much the unpopularity of Lord Harris evidenced by the circumstances connected with its erection as any good traits of his character.

16th January 1895.

V

At last, the friends and admirers of the retiring Governor, have held their public meeting. Even if His Excellency had been much worse than he is, it would not have been possible for us to speak disparagingly of any movement to give him a public farewell. The very fact of his having represented the Queen for five years, is enough to entitle him for it. As

regards His Excellency Lord Harris who has, with all his manifold errors, been always actuated with the best of intentions. we are quite unwilling to find fault with the speakers, who took part in the recent Town Hall meeting. Nevertheless, we shall be failing in our duty to the public if we did not protest against the toryism of some of the speakers who did not think it unbecoming on their part to cast slur on a Governor whose name has become a household word among the people of this Presidency. Mr. Hormusjee said "soon after his Excellency was inducted in his office, the whole swarm of sycophants, parasites, tale-bearers, self-aggrandisers—all creatures born of corruption, and feeding on corruption, instinctively felt and perceived that their occupation was gone—gone I hope never to return." Alas ! Does not this very speech prove to our bitter disappointment that the hope is not yet realized, and that there was at least a stray member of that swarm left behind to figure conspicuously in the Town-Hall ? Does he not remember that all the respectable members of his community, himself not excluded, were as loud, at the time of Lord Reay's departure, in proclaiming his virtues to the world as he is now in belittling him to show to advantage his present idol and can it be said that anything but the spirit of 'sycophancy,' and "self-aggrandization" is responsible for the change of opinion shadowed forth by the remarks of Mr. Hormusjee ? Does he need to be reminded that it was Lord Reay who incurred the odium of the Crawford Commission and withstood, with manliness, the displeasure of high personages, consequent on the drastic measures he adopted to clear the Augean Stable ? Sycophancy and Honesty are quite inconsistent and the fact of Mr. Hormusjee being a Judge cannot make him an exception to the general rule.

How demoralizing the atmosphere of the Town Hall was on the day of the meeting is shewn by the speech of Dr. Bhandarkar. No one can question the motives of the old Professor. But patronage and friendship sometimes lead the best of men into grievous error. The venerable Professor did not seem to have realized that his speech was as strong a reflection on Lord Reay as it was in praise of Lord Harris. As already observed, we have not the least desire to speak unkindly of the parting Governor but in justice to Lord Reay we are bound to ask the Doctor whether he was serious in complaining of the transfer of the Elphinstone College to the New Building. Probably he is not aware, while the College was in Byculla, Prof. Wordsworth year after year complained of the unhealthiness of the locality and that the boys regard the present quarters as more comfortable than the old. If he had known this certainly the

Professor was too honest to have indirectly cast a slur on Lord Reay who was one of our best champions of Higher Education. The Doctor was on more solid ground when he alluded to the distribution of patronage by His Excellency. We heartily join with him in his admiration of the honest desire of Lord Harris to be impartial, though unfortunately in an important matter he egregiously failed to carry out this desire by allowing his judgment to be warped by interested and one-sided information.

Of all the speeches delivered at the Town Hall, Mr. Cotton's was the best. It was temperate and carefully worded. But we cannot agree with him in giving credit to Lord Harris for any 'statesmanship' worth the name. Even though this speech bore evidence of his having ransacked the whole official record to make a decent case for the memorial, he has not been able to point out any large policy or scheme which may be said to have been due to the statesmanship of His Excellency. We are however in complete accord with him when he speaks of his Lordship's sociality and hospitality. That Lord Harris possesses a very kind heart, there can be no doubt. His affectionate nature, if it is a virtue socially, is his weakness as a statesman. He certainly would have been spared many of his more serious blunders if he had not allowed his judgment to be misled by the strong regard and affection he bore to those that surrounded him. But as Lord Harris well put it in his answer to the deputation of the Town Hall meeting, he has come here to do his best and that is done. If it falls short of what is expected from an able Governor he is not to blame.

6th February 1895.

VI

An opinion is gaining ground every day that the Parsis of the younger generation have not the independence and disinterestedness of their father and that they are day by day becoming more and more sycophantic. We could not, however, acquiesce in this opinion as we had before our eyes such public men as Messrs. Malabari, Pheroze Shah Mehta, Dadabhai Naoroji and Dinsha Edulji Vachha. But a letter published by a Parsi pleader in the *Times of India* and the speech of Mr. Hormusji, the Judge at the Town Hall, the merits of which we have already exposed seem to show that the opinion is not altogether unwarranted. The high and lucrative posts held by the members of the community under Government and the titles and honors conferred upon its leading members, all of which are undoubtedly well deserved, seem to have had a demoralizing effect on the

young and inexperienced of the community. Mr. Banajee seems to be very anxious not to be visited with punishment for the sin of honesty and patriotism of his more gifted and able caste-fellows. We very much sympathize with him, and hasten to assure him that he may depend upon this letter of his as a very safe preventive of any such visitation. We also hope he will soon be able to gather the golden harvest which he probably expects as a reward for faithfully following the lead of Mr. Hormusjee.

GUJERAT MITRA AND GUJERAT DARPAN.

(ANGLO-VERNACULAR.)

I

LORD HARRIS IN SCINDE.

Last week brought H. E. back to Bombay from his recent farewell tours. Lord Harris has proceeded to his capital direct from his last visit of Scinde. As we have observed before his have been no very stirring or interesting speeches. Those in reply to a municipal or a Chamber of Commerce address or another, or at a prize distribution, or after a dinner given in his honour, do not discover any points of local or general interest or anything new. It is not only in Gujerat that H. E. had some unwelcome reception as in the several suits for injunction, but at the Kurrachee Municipality meeting too, there was a rather rough brush and that from his own countrymen or Europeans. The address to be presented was condemned by this section among others as dealing with no local questions of note and as being a mere copy of the Chamber of the commerce address and the voting of the money by a circular also was equally called into question. But the matter went no further than the Municipal chamber. Still the straw indicates where and how the wind blows. Let the promoters of the Lord Harris memorial take note of this.

23rd December 1894.

II

LET HONOUR BE GIVEN WHERE IT IS DUE

is a very wholesome maxim for all public honours, and for the acknowledgment and appreciation of the services of our public men

whether official or non-official. If every dog that barks or every ass that brays, or raven that crows were to be patted on the back or adorned with the choicest honours we could afford there would be no discrimination between the most deserving and undeserving. We have been times out of number remarking that the present Governor, possesses very scant merit to be publicly feted, treated and memorialized on the eve of his departure. The several suits of injunctions filed against Gujerat Municipalities running riot to *Pooja* him should have taught the friends and admirers of Lord Harris to cease making any noise in the demonstration that they should have privately made for the idol of their worship. The packed meeting at the "Gulistan" of Mr. Marzban, where Dr. Bahadurji raised his sole and independent voice of protest, was simply and purely understood to be a private one. The protest on behalf of the public though overruled and overwhelmed by a majority in that Hall, did not die out there. But it was voiced out in the columns of our Bombay contemporaries, a Municipal Hall meeting was requisitioned and protests of Corporators poured in and it had to be abandoned there and held in the Chamber of Commerce buildings. The names of those that have thus raised their voice against such proceedings are a guarantee in themselves of the right they command and of the honesty and straightforwardness of purpose that inspire them. We trust that the promoters of Lord Harris Memorial will not, after these strong proofs of public disapproval of their acts to father them on the "public, persist in them and they will not give their measures a colour that they do not possess. Lord Harris too we hope with his true English instincts will not accept such false honours.

27th January 1895.

III

LORD HARRIS'S ENTERTAINMENTS.

The past few weeks and the events that took place in them! What shallowness or hollowness rules in those feting, treating, memorial meetings and deputations! We are too pachydermatous to be impressed with any of these Tamashas. It is perhaps the fault of the Bombay Presidency weather, H. E. should have said the Gujerat and Deccan weather, which has made us so sceptical, so analytical, and so critical, as H. E. remarked to the deputation that waited on him at the Secretariat with the Resolutions of the meeting of his friends and admirers. We do not go into

the facts and statistics of these memorializations as our contemporaries of Ahmedabad and Bombay have treated them so threadbare. The *Bombay Samachar* has been doing a real service by detailing the public works of our retiring Governor, as also the *Hitechhu* who has shown what the majority of the friends and admirers of Lord Harris consist of. With the exception of Messrs. Fazalbhai and Dharamsi and Doctors Bhandarkar and Cowasji there were very few men of note, light and leading among those friends and admirers. And the speeches though lofty in some respects fall flat on the public at large. The organizers of the meeting, it was a great pity, could find no man of eminence and leadership among them. We miss our Mehtas, Yajniks, Setalvads, Tyebjis, Sayanis, Wachhas and Bahadurjis there. We regret to have to be so hard upon our Presidential Rule at the time of his departure. In no public matter has Lord Harris showed any depth of observation, any breadth of views, or any capacity of sound and sober and clear judgment. It is only in his time that the races of the Presidency have been so estranged as at present. It is a goodly lesson for all future rulers as to how they should behave. The force of public opinion has compelled the memorialists as well as their idol, Lord Harris, to estimate the movement at its true worth as being nothing more nor less than that of H. E.'s friends and admirers. The cases of Sir James Fergusson now amongst us and of Sir Richard Temple were far better. The memorials of these Governors might have been received with hisses but those of the present Governor are received with groans and expressions of sorrow and shade. We regret very much that the gentlemen referred to above by us, should have been at all parties to such a gross and unhappy force. The Hon'ble Mr. Wadia too must be feeling very awkward in the situation he has been merged in.

10th February 1895.

SOODHARAK.

(ANGLO-VERNACLULAR)

OVERDOING SIMPLY SPOILS.

We recommend to the special notice of our readers the following letter of a Bombay friend of us who perhaps, with great propriety, signs himself *A Balance* :—

“ Mr. Editor, the general opinion expressed by you in the Marathi columns of your paper last week on the administration of our retiring Governor was on the whole very judicious and impartial, and I have hardly to say anything against it. In that article, you do not appear to have taken any objection to the movement that is set on foot here to give an entertainment to His Excellency. And that was very proper on your part. The friends and admirers of his Excellency, and for the matter of that those of anybody, have a perfect right to privately entertain any person whom they like. But from the doings of this week, it would appear that his Lordship's friends and admirers are not satisfied with a private entertainment. If possible, they would pass it for a public entertainment. The Entertainment Committee is already put forward as a Representative Committee which is not only to call in subscriptions and make arrangements for an entertainment, but also to open a general subscription list, in its representative capacity, to perpetuate the memory of his Excellency's benevolent, straightforward, impartial, firm, wise and therefore popular administration. Those who will carefully read the speeches made by several speakers in the Town Hall on Tuesday last will not be able, I feel sure, of accusing me of exaggeration. For the reputation of His Excellency and that of his friends and admirers I would implore the leading spirits of this movement to let it be of a private nature as originally designed and not to make an attempt to give it a form of a public movement. Even the best friends of His Excellency cannot say that it has the character of similar public movements made to perpetuate the memory of Reay or Ripou. In those cases, the initiation was Indian and not Anglo-Indian as in the present case. If two or three stalwart Anglo-Indians, official and non-official, who can be easily identified by the people of Bombay, had not interested themselves in this movement from the very conception of it, it would certainly never have assumed that shape and those proportions which it has assumed to-day. We admire the tact, the skill and the cleverness of the chief organizers, but for all

that, we cannot allow it to pass for what it is not. It is no use telling us that the figure of the subscriptions raised for a memorial of Lord Reay rose to about Rs. 45,000 as in the present case, that about Rs. 25,000 of this big sum was paid by Native Princes and Chiefs, and that the number of subscribers in the first case was much smaller than in the latter. The revelation of such facts cannot induce us to look upon the present as a thoroughly popular movement. Lord Harris has been, as good a friend of Native Chiefs and princes as Lord Reay was and we are prepared to admit that their contributions in the present case are as voluntary and sincere as they were in the last. But what about the initiation and the rest of the money? The Provincial Conference and the National Congress passed a vote of confidence in the administration of Lord Reay. The Corporation of this city, of its own accord, voted an address on the eve of Lord Reay's career. Such honour was never before shown by this body, to any of the previous Governors of Bombay. It was as unique as it was spontaneous. Now look to the general popularity of the present movement. Far from thinking of giving an address, the majority of the members of the Corporation would not even allow the Municipal Commissioner to hold a meeting in this connection in its Hall. Then, again, if the present is a *bona fide* public movement, how is it that the most acknowledged leaders of the Town and Presidency of Bombay such as the Hon'ble P. M. Metha and the Hon'ble Yajnik are conspicuous only by their absence from it? The friends and admirers of the Governor will, I am afraid, spoil a cause which is not quite bad, by insisting upon giving it a thoroughly representative public character. By such insistence, those who are not kindly disposed towards this movement will give up their present attitude of cold silence and sullenness, become its active opponents, and try to mar its beauty by drawing unseemly contrasts between the faults and merits of the present administration and those of its predecessor. I sincerely wish that this should not come to pass because, although I cannot look upon Lord Harris as the ideal Governor I do think that he deserves some respect at our hands for his straightforwardness, urbanity and a general disposition to do good and to forward the cause of progress in a cautious manner. I trust His Excellency's friends and admirers will, hereafter at least, refrain from making comparisons between him and his predecessor; because they will only stimulate the partisans of either to extol their idol at the expense of the other. The strong will that brought men like Wilson and Crawford to justice and established an Institution like the Victoria Jubilee Technical Institute still exercises such a charm over the national mind that a reflection such as Doctor

Bhandarkar appeared to cast on it, is likely to be seriously resented. I do not myself say anything about it, because I entertain such a great respect for the revered doctor that I am always unwilling to say aught that is likely to give pain to his feelings. Doctor Bhandarkar knows well that perfect good feeling existed between Lord Reay's Government and the Managers of the Fergusson College to the last day of his administration, in spite of the withdrawal of the grant of Rs. 3,000 which that Institution had enjoyed for several years. It was also idle on the part of the speakers at the Town Hall to try to make out a case in favour of Lord Harris' educational policy by showing that the expenditure of education and the number of schools had increased. The same could be said of Lord Reay's Administration. As population increases from year to year, so the State revenue increases and with that increase the expenditure too on every department of the Administration has to be increased to meet the increasing wants of the people. Much also was said at Tuesday's meeting about Lord Harris' liberal Forest Administration and encouragement to physical education given by him. In the first of these two cases, credit, we think, is as much if not more, due to Lord Reay as to Lord Harris; while in the second, I do not think any credit can be given to Lord Harris' Administration. The kind of impulse that we feel has been given to physical education is entirely due to Lord Harris' personal example and the personal interest he took in arranging Cricket Matches and other manly sports. It was very wise on the part of the promoters of Tuesday's meeting that they studiously avoided any reference to the ability of their favourite for the strength of His Excellency, in my humble opinion, lies not on the intellectual but on the moral side of his character. Lord Harris is good but not great, and although he has done, several things for which he can be justly praised, there are others for which general native opinion at least cannot be favourable to him. The failure to discover the true cause or causes of the Bombay riots, the systematic ignoring of the Central Division and the native mercantile associations in the distribution of the recommendation seats of the Legislative Council, the extreme severity of the Wai Trials, the very low standard laid down for admission into the Provincial Service, the slight inclination latterly shown to be partial to Mahomedans, and on the whole the unsatisfactory manner in which the police and other officers were allowed to deal with the riots—these are regarded as the grave faults of the present Administration which considerably detract from its merit. Therefore anything that may be done to perpetuate His Excellency's memory will always be looked upon as a memorial raised by his friends and admirers, both Native and European, but not a public memorial."

19th January 1895.

THE MAHRATTA.

(ENGLISH.)

I.

MEMORIAL TO LORD HARRIS.

Speaking of Lord Harris we are reminded of a pretty little meeting held on last Monday at the residence of K. B. M. C. Marzban in Bombay. This was a preliminary meeting convened for resolving to give an entertainment to Lord Harris for the interest he has taken in cricket and other sports. So far there could have been nothing very objectionable ; but the organizers of the meeting, if we may judge by their later conduct, appear to have had a more ambitious project in their mind ; for they eventually succeeded in passing a resolution to give a *public* entertainment to his Lordship. They counted upon a well-packed and submissive meeting which would resolve anything they liked, in the name of all castes and creeds, and which could thus easily give it, by means of a little juggling, the character of a representative gathering. They counted without their host however. Dr. K. N. Bahadurji surprised them with an unexpected opposition and could only be silenced after the Chairman's ruling. The only original proposition was then carried by majority. The strangest part of the proceeding, however, if we are to believe Dr. Bahadurji's story as contained in his letter to the papers, was the proposal made to him afterwards to modify the duly passed resolution to suit his wishes, if only he would withdraw his opposition. So ended what appears to be a prelude to the big Lord Harris Memorial movement. If we are correctly informed, the friends and admirers of his Lordship are working hard to organize a public meeting to vote a statue to Lord Harris. The meeting is to be held, we are told, in the Bombay Municipal Hall on next Tuesday, and wealthy men in Bombay are already being bothered for subscriptions, however small, to the statue-fund. We hope wealthy men in Bombay are not so gullible and devoid of sense as to fall an easy prey to these subscription touters. But there is no knowing what importunity and a certain degree of callousness to public opinion may not accomplish. If the rumour has any foundation, it would also have to be considered who takes the responsibility on his head of giving the Municipal Hall for the use of the meeting without the sanction of the Corporation ; but from the choice of this Hall it is clear that

even the friends of Lord Harris do not expect a large gathering. What is then the use of it and what is the worth of such a memorial? But that is not our business.

Now why all this fuss about a memorial, we ask. Does Lord Harris stand in such a need of a permanent memorial? In our opinion he has himself made sufficient provision to perpetuate his memory after his departure, at least for twelve months. The victims of the Bombay riots who are now rotting in prison will not forget him. The accused in the Poona riots will ever remember him. The Tower scandal will suffice the Parsees and the Marathas will con the Ahmednagar speech. What can a marble statue do more than these brilliant achievements of his Lordship's administration. A statue like that of Sir R. Temple has the risk of being daubed and painted black by *badmashes*, but His Excellency's administrative acts will ever shine forth in the pages of history as if written in indelible ink. What a fatuity has then seized Lord Harris' friends who are moving earth and heaven for a bit of stone, when so glorious memorials have been furnished by His Excellency himself. We hope Lord Harris will soon stop their useless activity by letting them know definitely that he will never consent to be degraded to a marble statue. On the other hand the public also will have to be on their guard to prevent such a travesty of public memorials.

13th January, 1895.

II.

A MEMORIAL TO LORD HARRIS.

A leaflet is being largely circulated which contains the following questions and answers. Certain flatterers of Lord Harris only have made possible a leaflet like the present one.

"Does Lord Harris deserve any permanent memorial? We give below the two different sets of replies:—

YES,

ACCORDING TO HIS FRIENDS AND
ADMIRERS.

1. Because he is a jolly good fellow and a keen cricketer to boot.

NO.

ACCORDING TO NATIVE
PUBLIC OPINION.

1. Because there is not a single public act of importance which could be associated with his name or which could be reasonably pointed out as having materially promoted the permanent interests of the people of this Presidency.

2. Because he is kindness itself and smothers those who have the "privilege" to come into contact with him with an abundance of rose-water and kisses which is simply charming.

3. Because he possesses those eminent qualifications of "straight-forwardness" and "manly intercourse" which contribute so much towards eliciting popular esteem and regard.

4. Because in the conduct of the administration it was his policy never to regard public opinion, which he considers chaotic and ill-natured, if not ill-informed, but courageously acts on the opinion of his 'responsible' advisers who being 'experts' exactly know what is not best for the welfare of the people.

5. Because he insists on a party press as the only effectual means of learning the truth on public affairs and acting, with 'the strictest justice and impartiality'.

6. Because he is a staunch advocate of physical education among all classes of the Native community and has won golden opinions for his personal encouragement in the matter on the cricket-fields of Bombay and Poona.

7. Because, take him for all in all, he is a good Governor, *albeit* of mediocre talent.

2. Because his Government is singularly unfortunate in tact, sound judgment, and strict impartiality which should characterise an administration desirous of achieving success and inspiring popular confidence and respect.

3. Because he systematically ignores public opinion more or less, rules on the opinion of a bureaucracy well-known for its prejudice, passion and unsympathetic attitude towards all legitimate Native wishes and aspirations.

4. Because he neither cares to understand the true bearings of native grievances nor makes a serious attempt to render justice where justice is due. Moreover where European Interests collide with those of Natives, his Government gives the go-bye to the latter.

5. Because in the matter of the riots he has displayed a temper and a judgment which were not only uncalled for but utterly unworthy of one in his exalted and responsible position.

6. Because his ill-concealed bias against and unfounded attack on one of the great communities of the Presidency has been provocative of great indignation and sullen discontent.

7. Because he is everything which a Governor should not be and has alienated the sympathies of the Native community as a whole.

If a permanent memorial be decided upon, we beg to offer the following suggestions with reference to the shape which the memorial should take.

(1) One colossal cricket bat with Lord Harris kneeling in a reverential attitude before it.

(2) One colossal hammer which Lord Harris is engaged in vigorously applying on a lute representing the harmony between Hindus and Mahomedans.

January, 13th 1895.

III.

PROPOSED MEMORIAL TO LORD
HARRIS.

The friends and admirers of H. E. the Governor seem to have at last determined to make a public demonstration of their admiration of the merits of the departing Governor. A preliminary meeting of these friends and admirers was held on Tuesday last at the rooms of the Chamber of Commerce, the unauthorised use of the Municipal Hall for the occasion being successfully objected to by some of the members of the Corporation. The proceedings of this meeting, as reported in the Bombay dailies, are very meagre and they give us no insight into the speeches made on the occasion or if no speeches were made into the discussion that must have taken place at the time. The meeting appears to have been convened by Messrs. Acworth, Cotton and Beaufort backed up by three Natives, two of whom have already attained the distinction of being honourable members while the third is aspiring after it. Amongst the names of those present, we notice only two from the mofussil, Mr. D. D. Adhikari, a honorary Magistrate of Poona, and the other that of our learned Doctor, the Vice-chancellor of the University, who can well include himself amongst the friends and admirers of the retiring Governor. One of these gentlemen had the honour of seconding the motion, for appointing the Chairman and the other proposed a vote of thanks to him. The proceedings were thus opened and closed by the two mofussilists at the meeting and the friends and admirers of Lord Harris may well congratulate themselves upon the fact that in a certain sense all their proceedings may be said to have the sympathy and support of the mofussil population so worthily represented by the two gentlemen who hailed from Poona. The object of the meeting was stated by the Chairman to be "to place upon a business footing" a movement which was taking place among them at the close of Lord Harris' government to perpetuate the memory of the Governor by some memorial the nature of which is yet to be settled." Not a word was said, or if said, has not been reported as to the necessity of such a movement or whether His Excellency Lord Harris' government was of such a nature as to deserve a memorial of this kind. Friendship is blind and admiration blinder still; so it did not probably occur to the gentlemen present that any such awkward questions would be put to them or that they were in any way bound to answer them. That they all of them admire Lord Harris, though they

were not pleased to tell us for what and that they had their purses with them was quite enough to raise a memorial with and it was resolved *nem con* " that a meeting of friends and admirers of Lord Harris be called on Tuesday the 29th January 1895 at 5 p. m. at the Town Hall and that the gentlemen present do form themselves into a provisional committee to make the necessary arrangements for holding such meeting." This concluded the business of the day and to the report of the proceedings is annexed the first instalment of the list of subscribers to the memorial fund. It appears from this list that Rs. 25,000 and odd have been subscribed up to date. Of the sum Rs. 7,000 are subscribed by the Maharaja of Bhavnagar ; Rs. 4,000 by the Maharaja of Kolhapur, and Rs. 1,000 each by the Rajas of Akalkot, Chhota Udaipur, Dharampur, Jasdan and the Nabab of Janjira. The Raja Sahob of Santrampur comes next with Rs. 750. The Chiefs of Kagal, Bhore and Sangli with Sir Dinshaw Petit have each subscribed a sum of Rs. 500 ; while that of Javar contributes Rs. 300. Thus in all about Rs. 19,000 out of a total of Rs. 25,000 have been subscribed by the rulers or Chiefs of the Native States and the memorial may be said, so far as the subscription list goes at present, to be the outcome of the support derived from these Chiefs. Lord Lansdowne's memorial was, if we remember right, similarly supported by the Native Chiefs and it is not therefore surprising to find that there are so many friends and admirers of Lord Harris among the rulers of the Native States in this Presidency, though one cannot easily see what special good His Excellency has done to these Native Chiefs during the term of his office.

Such are the proceedings of the preliminary meeting held in Bombay during this week and we have not the least doubt that the admirers of Lord Harris will carry out the programme which they have set before themselves. But still a question naturally arises whether a memorial like the one in question raised entirely by the friends and admirers of the Governor can be called a public memorial in the sense in which that word is ordinarily understood. No man in this world is without friends and in our opinion a Governor of a Province gains little credit, if amongst a population of two crores and more he finds a few friends and admirers of himself. We do not know if the friends and admirers of Lord Harris have consulted His Excellency's wishes as regards the desirability of raising his memorial in this way, but if His Excellency were consulted on this point we do not think that Lord Harris would have been less outspoken to his admirers than to the people of the Deccan in general. He would have told them in plain terms that a memorial by friends and admir-

ers is worth nothing from a public point of view, and that if there are private obligations to be acknowledged and debts of gratitude to be paid, a public meeting and a public memorial is not the way to do it. Lord Harris the Governor has been very particular to inquire if the Sarvajanic Sabha is really a representative body composed of Hindu, Mahomedan and Parsee gentlemen and some unpleasant correspondence has taken place between the Government and the Sabha on the subject. Will Lord Harris make similar inquiries of his friends and admirers and ask them to show cause why they should style themselves, representative European and Native gentlemen of Bombay? Whom do they represent and in what? If they are the representative admirers of Lord Harris we have nothing to say; but if covertly or otherwise the friends and admirers of Lord Harris wish to give a representative character to their meeting we must strongly protest against such procedure. Not only would it be discreditable to the gentlemen themselves but it would reflect discredit even upon His Excellency. It cannot be a secret that the public of this Presidency are not satisfied with the administration of His Excellency and that in spite of the efforts of Lord Harris' friends and admirers no more than two gentlemen from the mofussil were found to join in the movement. The very fact that the meeting to be held on the 29th inst. is to be a meeting of friends and admirers alone is, we believe, a sufficient comment upon Lord Harris' career as a Governor and if His Excellency were properly advised he would put a stop to this friendly demonstration which by contrast only brings into prominence the unpopularity of his public career and the unwillingness of the general public to do him any honour which a better retiring Governor could have obtained from them. It is not a question of money; for money can be had as well if not better from a few rich admirers as from the general public at large. There are many amongst those mentioned in the list of subscribers to the memorial fund, who can each, if so minded, individually pay double the amount now subscribed for the memorial or erect a statue of Lord Harris solely at his own expense. But that is not the way we are to look at these questions. It is the Governorship of Lord Harris that these admirers of his are going to commemorate and they had no right to do so publicly unless with the sympathy and support of the general public. We say "publicly" advisedly; for every friend and admirer of Lord Harris has full liberty to worship an idol of His Excellency in his house if he deems it necessary or desirable to do so. But when these friends and admirers come forth publicly and raise a fund, albeit between themselves, for a public memorial of the object of their

admiration, it is nothing but an encroachment upon public rights which every member of the public can legitimately object to. A work of public utility, constructed solely out of private funds, may be named after a friend or a relation of the donor of the endowment. But the case is quite different from the one under consideration. Here a work constructed by a private fund is not dedicated to the public but a public memorial is to be raised solely by the friends and admirers of the Governor, and we do not think that it would be either decent or legitimate for the admirers to do so unless they form a majority of the public which as a matter of fact they do not in the present case. A public memorial is a peculiar honour and it would certainly lose its value if a few admirers of anybody—and it must be borne in mind that every one, be he a good or bad man, has his own admirers—are allowed to raise a public memorial to him. We do not grudge to these admirers of Lord Harris the pleasure of having His Excellency's statues erected in their private halls, but on principle we strongly protest against the raising of a public memorial by some friends and admirers alone. We do not know if it will please the individual who is to be so honoured; but we have little doubt that it is highly objectionable on public grounds and that it is nothing short of deceiving the public, if not also the recipient of such honour. We hope that his character of the movement will be fully explained in the meeting to be held in the Town Hall on the 29th Instant. It is well if the admirers see it themselves, but, if not, public interests demand that it should be explained to them in the clearest possible terms.

20th January 1895.

IV.

AN AUDACIOUS MISREPRESENTATION.

We pointed out last time how the friends and admirers of Lord Harris are trying to give representative character to their efforts to raise a memorial to the retiring Governor, though they know full well that His Excellency's government is far from being popular in any sense of the word. Lord Harris is, of course, not devoid of good qualities; but as a Governor he has proved a failure and the public of this Presidency, much less the people of Deccan, can never be induced to commemorate his Governorship by raising a public memorial in his honour. All this is enough to any man of common sense, and we thought that the admirers

of a Governor, outspoken enough to declare in a public meeting that the good people of Deccan only wanted a little more of common-sense to make them peaceful citizens, would themselves exhibit at least a respectable share of that valuable commodity in their endeavours to perpetuate the memory of a Governor who has completely alienated the sympathies of the public by his studied discourteous conduct and habitual disregard of public opinion in almost all important matters. But the proceedings of the Bombay meeting did not give us much hope in this respect and the account of the so-called Poona meeting, telegraphed to the Bombay dailies, proves beyond doubt that there are people who are interested in misrepresenting facts so as to invest, if possible, a movement of friends and admirers with a representative character which it cannot possibly claim. We do not know what object is to be gained by such misrepresentations. If the admirers of Lord Harris wish to deceive themselves into a belief that they are the real representatives of the people in this matter, it is impossible to do so; for none can be better acquainted with the true nature of the facts than themselves. Perhaps somebody wishes to deceive His Excellency and make him think that the memorial raised in his honour is a public memorial voted and subscribed for by the representatives of the different communities in the Presidency. If so, the attempt is alike discreditable and, we are afraid, sure to be disapproved and exposed by His Excellency himself. The keen eye of Lord Harris, which has discovered an imaginary flaw in the representative character of the Sarvajanic Sabha, cannot fail to find out the truth in the reports of the so-called public meetings his friends and admirers have convened and are trying to convene at different places. Outspokenness is one of the virtues attributed to His Excellency by his admirers and if he blindly accepts or allows a memorial to be raised entirely by friends and admirers as one raised by the public or its representatives, the public are sure to attribute it to his over-eagerness to have his Governorship somehow or other commemorated. In the interests of all parties concerned, it is therefore desirable that the true nature of the efforts of His Excellency's friends be publicly made known; and we, therefore, give below what we have learnt regarding the meeting of a few friends held at Khan Bahadur Dorabjee Pundamjee's house.

The correspondents of the Bombay dailies and the writers in the local dailies have described this meeting as a meeting of the principal representatives of Hindu, Parsee and Mahomedan communities of Poona. But on inquiry we have found out

that this description of the meeting is totally erroneous. What happened was as follows. One of the promoters of the Bombay meeting has been writing to his friends in Poona urging them to do something for the retiring Governor. No gentleman can long withstand these friendly calls, especially when he is asked to do something more as a piece of politeness to a retiring high official. A private circular was therefore sent round, over the signature of two gentlemen, inviting about twenty men to meet at Khan Bahadur Dorabjee's house with a view to help the Bombay movement for raising a memorial to Lord Harris. In pursuance of this call, about fifteen gentlemen were present at Padumjee's house and constituting themselves into a meeting of friends and admirers of Lord Harris, they subscribed between themselves about Rs. 700 and resolved to send the sum to Bombay to supplement the Bombay fund. Dr. Bhandarkar was in the chair and he and Khan Bahadur Dorabjee were the speakers of the day. The meeting was so private in its character that none but the invited were to attend and little was known about it in the city until its proceedings were published in the daily papers of Bombay. It is absurd to speak of such a meeting of the representatives of different communities and it would be a mistake on the part of Lord Harris to allow his admirers to misrepresent the public opinion in this way. It is no secret that Lord Harris has the least claim on the attention of the Hindu community in Poona and if we mistake not that community would be ready to resent any misrepresentation of its attitude towards His Excellency's Government. It is rather unpleasant to have to refer to past incidents. But we must here state that in the opinion of the Hindu community in Poona the recent disturbance in the city were more due to the policy sanctioned and approved, if not initiated, by Lord Harris' Government in this respect and that His Excellency's Government has shown remarkable want of judgment and discretion in appealing against the decisions of the Sessions Judge. With these incidents fresh in their mind the Hindus of Poona, in a body, cannot be expected to subscribe to the Harris memorial fund. They are a few individual Hindus who have received or who expect to receive favour at the hands of Lord Harris, and these on private grounds may join in a movement which helps them to pay their debts of gratitude to His Excellency. But none of them can and does call himself a representative of any community and it is libelling the Hindu community in Poona and deceiving His Excellency to describe these gentlemen as they have been described by the correspondents of the Bombay dailies. The communities of Poona are not so small, illiterate or backward as to

be represented by a committee of dozen people assembled in a private room at Khan Bahadur Dorabjee Pudamjee's house. Public meetings are not unknown in Poona and the public here know too well how to express their wishes and grievances, to allow a meeting of a dozen admirers of Lord Harris to be palmed off as a meeting of their representatives. The very fact that the meeting was invited by a private circular and held in a private house almost outside the city shows what it signifies ; but in order to remove any doubt on the point we shall quote here the correspondence that took place between a Hindu gentleman of this city and a Rao Bahadur who attended the meeting. The former wrote to the latter as follows :—

POONA, 25th January, 1895.

My dear:—I read in the papers yesterday that you were present at a meeting held at Khan Bahadur Dorabjee's house to raise subscriptions to Lord Harris memorial fund and I found that the meeting was described as one of the representatives of the Hindu, the Parsee and Mahomedan communities. I shall therefore feel obliged if you will kindly inform me what form of invitation was adopted for convening the meeting, how many were present and whether the meeting was a representative one or whether you were invited as a representative. I am &c.

To this note the Rao Bahadur who was present at the meeting replied as follows :—

My dear:—The meeting was invited by a private circular by two friends and was attended by about fifteen gentlemen. I did not go there in any representative capacity. Yours &c.

Similar replies were given by others who invited or attended the meeting. Neither the promoters nor the members of the meeting did, therefore, in the least intend to assume any representative character and when they are prepared to admit the private character of the meeting in so many words, it is needless to make further comments on this matter. Every one has a perfect right to perpetuate the memory of his friend and we cannot deny that right to the friends and admirers of Lord Harris or to the recipients of or aspirants after the honours he can confer without distinction of caste as Dr. Bhandarkar put it in his short but telling speech. We only wanted to contradict and correct the misrepresentation made by the correspondents of the Bombay dailies and what we have stated above is sufficient for this purpose. If with the true facts before him, His Excellency is still pleased to accept or approve, directly or indirectly, a memorial at the hands of a few friends when the bulk of the population is sullenly keeping aloof from such movement His Excellency is at liberty to do so.

27th February, 1895.

V.

A MEETING OF LORD HARRIS' ADMIRERS.

In spite of the glowing and exaggerated accounts of the meeting of the friends and admirers of Lord Harris held on Tuesday last in Bombay, for the purpose of raising a memorial to His Excellency, we do not think that after all there is any reason for His Excellency or his admirers to be satisfied with their efforts. If any one carefully goes over the list of the persons present at the meeting, he cannot fail to observe that it was a packed meeting in which the usual Bombay public leaders were conspicuous by their absence. True, it has been described as a meeting of all the classes of the Native community; but the audience in the Hall created no such impression on the mind of any one unless he went there to see things through the glasses of His Excellency's friends and admirers. Bombay is a city of different races, creeds and communities and it is no wonder if a few European, Parsee and Mahomedan merchants could bring with them some Marwaries and Multanies who hardly understood a word of what was going on, and who, after gracing the Hall with their presence in order to oblige this or that *shetiah*, left it when the principal speaker had hardly finished the first part of his laudatory speech. The Hindus—by which we mean the two large communities of Gujaratis and Deccanis—in Bombay were as a class fully apathetic and if a few of them went to the Town Hall on the day of the meeting, it was more to see how the farce of a memorial meeting was played by the admirers of His Excellency. It is said that the presence of Jews, Marwaries and Multanies fully testified the general popularity of Lord Harris amongst all classes of the Native community. That is one inference or assumption no doubt; and from the admirers' point of view it may be correct. But to the public at large, the whole affair at the Town Hall proves, if it proves anything, that Messrs. Wadia, Cotton and Co., if they are so minded, can convene a meeting of six or seven hundred men, provided you do not much care who attends it and for what reason. One of the speakers at the meeting is reported to have said that the chief feature of Lord Harris' administration was that after he was inducted in his office "the whole swarm of sycophants, parasites, tale-bearers, self-aggrandizers, all creatures born of corruption and feeding on corruption" and all *khatpaties* vanished at once. But the speaker was probably wanting in sense of humour to address the meeting of the admirers of a departing Governor in this way. No better proof to-

'falsify the above allegation than the history and character of the meeting itself could have been given, and unless Mr. Hormusji Dadabhoy was unconsciously ironical, we can only set down this deliberate misrepresentation and abuse to some mental aberration of the speaker. Of the Hindus Dr. Bhandarkar was there of course and we do not wish again to examine the motives that led him to take part in this meeting. As for Mr. Justice Ranade we doubt if he was correctly represented as being present at the meeting as one of His Excellency's admirers. But as regards Dr. Kunte we can confidently say that he did not attend the meeting though his name appears amongst those of the persons present, unless the Doctor had recently acquired the supernatural power of being present in Poona and Bombay at one and the same time. Mr. Adhikari, who is nobody in Poona and was never heard to have taken any active interest in any public movement hitherto, was there simply to advertise that he was an ancient vatandar of the Deccan. The names of Messrs. V. N. Nattu and Dandekar appear on the Memorial Committee appointed at the meeting, but both these gentlemen were not present at the meeting, and if we mistake not, their names seem to have been added in order to give, if possible, representative character to the meeting. But in spite of these efforts we do not think that any one, not excluding even the admirers of Lord Harris, was deceived by the farce played in the Town Hall on Tuesday last. A meeting of seven hundred men in Bombay is hardly a meeting at all. If you block a road for a few minutes you can get a larger audience and the admirers of Lord Harris have done nothing better. Each one of them tried to bring in his friends and admirers and failing that his employees and the Town Hall we are told, was soon filled with an assembly consisting of members of all the heterogeneous communities in Bombay. It was before such a meeting that Mr. Cotton, Dr. Bhandarkar and the Hon. Mr. Fazalbhay Vishram unburdened their hearts of the overpowering feelings of gratitude that were seeking an outlet so long.

Let us, however, pass on to the speeches made at this meeting and see, if any of the speakers has anything to urge in justification of the objects of the meeting. There was of course much sweet flattery and laudatory rhetoric, much incense and breath wasted. But even a superficial reader of these speeches cannot fail to perceive in them the absence of any cogent reasons for raising a memorial to Lord Harris. Mr. Cotton and Dr. Bhandarkar are both shrewd and capable gentlemen and both of them would not omit a single point that would go to magnify the

deity they felt bound to worship. But one is very much disappointed to see that they have very little to urge in support of the movement set on foot by them. Every one who spoke at the meeting felt that he was saying something which was directly contradictory to the general public opinion, and he has tried to put forward an excuse to justify his Lordship's unpopularity. You cannot please *all*, says one of them, and the other seconds him by observing that after all His Excellency was too straightforward and outspoken for some people and that the time for taking a dispassionate review of His Excellency's administration had not yet arrived. Every speaker thus seems to have felt the burden of public opinion weighing heavily upon him, so heavily that he dared not leave it unnoticed. It would be a pity, if not a misfortune if Governors, and Governors-General deem it advisable to accept such a tribute of praise from their admirers on the eve of their retirement. We say misfortune deliberately, for if this practice becomes general, the absence of memorials like these would soon come to be considered as a sign of the appreciation of a Governor's good qualities.

Coming, however, to the specific reasons for which the admirers of Lord Harris desire to raise a memorial to him, we find that none of the speakers makes any reference to the large measures of His Excellency's administration. None of the speakers, for instance, alluded to the rules under the Councils Act or gave any justification for the extremely conservative if not a retrograde scheme of the Provincial Service recommended by His Excellency's Government. The subject of the riots between Hindus and Mahomedans and the high-handed and one-sided action of Government in Yeola, Poona and Wai cases was similarly left untouched, so much so that not a word was uttered in explanation of the unreasonable and partial conduct of Lord Harris' Government in this behalf. Every one of His Excellency's admirers seems to have been afraid even to mention these subjects. They spoke eloquently of the hospitality and straightforwardness of His Excellency and the encouragement he gave to physical education. But that was all, and no one seems to have questioned himself whether it was enough to justify a memorial. Mr. Cotton told us about the increase in the municipalities and schools but we fail to see how Lord Harris deserves any credit for this increase. The number of the village schools has been increasing gradually every year and will go on increasing ever after Lord Harris leaves our shores. There is therefore, as much sense in adducing this increase in schools as a proof of His Excellency's successful administration as in urging that Lord Harris was one of the

most popular Governors of Bombay because the average rainfall during his five years' administration was above the normal rate for the Presidency. Dr. Bhandarkar tried to be more logical and instituted a comparison between some measures of Lord Harris and those of his distinguished and able predecessor. But the learned Doctor had to misrepresent facts for the purpose and then too he could hardly make out a case in favour of his patron. It is a well-known fact that Lord Reay gave up the idea of amalgamating the Deccan and the Fergusson College solely in deference to the enlightened public opinion in this Presidency, an opinion in the formation of which the learned Doctor had his own part. Can Dr. Bhandarkar point out to a single important question wherein Lord Harris' Government has respected public opinion in this way? We were again surprised to find that a Vice-Chancellor who, in his convocation address asked Government to spend more money on higher education, should now come forward to declare that Lord Harris' Government did all that it could for all kinds of education in this Presidency. The learned Doctor did not also fail to pay a tribute of praise to Lady Harris whose very form to his eyes is dignity incarnate. The learned Doctor, however, plainly admitted at the close of his speech that the meeting he was addressing was a meeting of friends and admirers alone and observed that it would have been a meeting of the general public of Bombay if His Excellency had been a pupil of Talleyrand. This was of course said in justification of himself and other co-admirers of Lord Harris. But reading between the lines one can easily see how heavily the speakers at the meeting were feeling the weight of the adverse public opinion in this matter. A gentleman of Dr. Bhandarkar's position ought to know that it is ridiculous to affirm that Lord Harris has offended the public by his outspokenness, evidently suggesting thereby that those who pleased them did so by concealing their thoughts. It is not the words but measures of Lord Harris that have made him unpopular and no memorials raised solely by his admirers and friends would remove that stigma from his administration. It is true that the interests of the various communities in this Presidency often conflict, but that is exactly why a strong and a capable Governor is required to manage its affairs. Lord Harris, according to the general public opinion, has not exhibited this high capacity and it was for His Excellency's admirers to show that the public have judged wrongly in this matter. But the speakers at the last Tuesday's meeting have done nothing of the kind and beyond the fact that His Excellency is a good

cricketer and hospitable host and an outspoken if not an indiscreet speaker, his admirers has given us no reason whatever why a public memorial should be raised to perpetuate the memory of his Governorship. So far as the public are concerned there is therefore no reason why they should not continue to look upon this movement as a sectarian one proceeding from the people who have debts of gratitude to pay; for if the meeting proved anything, it proved that even the worst of Governors could have his own friends and admirers and these latter could bring together a few hundred people to vote a statute for the object of their admiration. We do not think that this means much and the farce of a meeting in the Town Hall was quite unnecessary for the purpose.

3rd February 1895.

VI.

FAREWELL TO LORD HARRIS.

In spite of the farewell parties and memorial meetings which the friends and admirers of Lord Harris have been busy in organizing, and in spite of the glowing accounts that appear in the Bombay dailies of the success of these entertainments one cannot fail to observe that everywhere there is a feeling that His Excellency has failed to satisfy the different communities in the Presidency. Attempts are made to make the parties as representative as possible; but the more representative it becomes the greater is the silence observed regarding the merits of His Excellency's administration of this Presidency for the last five years. The address of the committee of the Lord Harris entertainment and Shield fund studiously avoided any reference to His Excellency's career as a Governor and the reception at the Readymoney House was nothing more than an innocent social party in honour of the retiring Governor. Lord Harris himself has not failed to mark the real character of these gatherings. "I do not regard the friendly feeling conveyed by this entertainment," says he "that I have been successful, but I think for my own comfort I shall be justified in construing it to mean that there are a good many who think that I tried my best to be impartial." When His Excellency himself looks upon these demonstrations in such a light there is little to be said regarding their real significance. A Governor is too great a deity in the eyes of some to be allowed to pass away unworshipped or unnoticed and the friends and

admirers of Lord Harris have taken full advantage of this feeling in organizing farewell parties to His Excellency. This is not the place to expose all the tactics by which Princes, Chiefs and wealthy gentlemen have been made to take part in these entertainments. Suffice it to say that many who go to these gatherings do so either as a matter of formality or for pleasure or to pay debts of gratitude either for favours received or for favours to come. Had it been otherwise we should have found the merits of His Excellency's administration freely alluded to and discussed at each of these meetings: but as remarked above a tacit understanding seems to prevail everywhere that the subject is too delicate to be handled by a representative gathering. We do not know what pleasure or comfort a Governor can feel by such artificial demonstrations specially got up by a few persons. But as we have no experience of a Governor's life nor hope to have any, we are quite prepared to leave the decision of this question entirely to His Excellency. He has stated what comfort he would obtain from these entertainments and his judgment in the matter must be accepted as final. Lord Harris would be quite satisfied if a good many people think that he tried his best to be impartial. He does not care to know whether he succeeded or failed. But, if so, all this trouble and expense was certainly superfluous. His Excellency is undoubtedly unpopular but his errors have always been attributed to his want of ability to govern well and not to any uncharitable or unfriendly feeling on his part towards any individual or community. In other words it was generally admitted that he meant well and as stated above it was simply a waste of time and energy, if the entertainments of the week were arranged simply to prove this point.

So much about the general character of the entertainments. Let us now turn to the arguments of friends and admirers of Lord Harris to account for the admitted unpopularity of their idol. We have carefully read the speeches of His Excellency's friends and admirers on different occasions and the lengthy review of His Excellency's administration that appeared in one of the Bombay dailies. But we were surprised to find that in none of these any serious attempt was made to discuss some of the great questions taken up and decided by the local Government during the five years of His Excellency's administration. The speakers at the memorial meeting and the writer of the review in the *Bombay Gazette* have described in detail how the number of schools increased during the last five years or what public buildings were erected during

His Excellency's term of office. But even a superficial reader of these eulogies can easily see the irrelevancy and weakness of these arguments. Even under the worst possible Governor some progress in some direction is sure to take place. The population will grow and commerce increase in the same proportion; the Public Works Department will do its work and so will the other departments of the State; the Bhatia will start his mill and the ryot plough his land. But no one ever thinks that the success of a Governor is to be measured by these standards. The true function of a Governor is to regulate, supervise and control the administrative machinery and judged by this test Lord Harris' Government must be admitted to be an utter failure. Perhaps His Excellency would not have rendered himself so unpopular if some of the questions had not unfortunately cropped up during His Excellency's term of office. Lord Harris' weakness would have in that case remained undiscovered and if not for doing good he would have at least obtained credit for doing no harm. Even now public opinion is unanimous as to the encouragement he gave to physical education and that is why the fact is being repeated on every occasion. But beyond this one good feature of His Excellency's administration his admirers have little to urge—we mean little of importance or value—in justification of the attitude they have taken. As years roll on the number of schools, scholars and public buildings must increase even if there were no Governor to rule over the Presidency. The admirers of Lord Harris must therefore be prepared to show that His Excellency's claims to our gratitude are based upon a sounder basis; and we do not think that they have done it. The *Gazette* has devoted no less than nine columns to a review of Lord Harris' administration. But he has nowhere attempted to justify the decision and conduct of His Excellency's Government in the matter of the Provincial service, the working of the Councils Act or the treatment given to the Hindus in connection with the recent religious disturbances. The question of revenue enhancements in Panwell, Kolaba, Alibag and Deogad, the curtailment of the University grant, the passing of Mhowra Bill, the issue of confidential circulars containing questionable directions to subordinates and the scant courtesy with which public opinion was treated whether expressed in the memorials of public bodies or by the elected members of the Legislative Council are again some of the important weak points, or we may even say bad features of His Excellency's rule; and it is chiefly on account of these reasons that Lord Harris' administration has become extremely unpopular. Most of these questions are perfectly general, equally affecting all communities and races in the Presi-

dency. The argument that Lord Harris did not succeed because it was impossible to please all is, therefore, perfectly untenable. In the matter of the riots the Hindus in the Deccan have been specially ill-treated during Lord Harris' Government, but it is absurd to say that it is the only ground on which that community has refrained from taking part in the movement of raising a memorial to His Excellency. We cannot again understand why the conduct of His Excellency's Government towards one important community should not be taken into consideration in judging of the success or otherwise of his administration. A Governor that does injustice to one large community is quite capable of doing similar injustice to another and if he did not do so it was purely a matter of chance. If we, therefore, do not approve of Lord Harris' administration it is not because he displeased a particular community but because the administration was conducted on a wrong principle. Dr. Bhandarkar would ascribe His Excellency's unpopularity to his outspokenness; but this explanation is also equally unsatisfactory. Outspokenness is not necessarily inconsistent with popularity and in the case of Lord Harris it was quite possible for him to win people's affection by his deeds in spite of his outspokenness. It was in November 1891 that we made the following comparison of Lord Harris' administration with those of his predecessors. "Sir James Fergusson," we then wrote, "was generous and courteous, his successor Lord Reay was sympathetic in addition to being generous and courteous and His Excellency Lord Harris is more straightforward and outspoken. If it turns out in the end that he combines sympathy with our aspirations we shall not have much reason to be sorry for having to pass five years under him. During the last two years we are constrained to say, little respect is shown to public opinion, less confidence is placed in its genuineness and no encouragement is given to even its growth or even to its focussing; so that we fear if His Excellency is not pleased to modify his policy the net result of his five years rule would be almost nothing." This was what we said in 1891 long before any particular community was ill-treated, insulted or maligned and subsequent events have shown that the opinion we then gave requires hardly any modification except that the apprehensions then entertained have now been fully realised and that the five years' rule of Lord Harris would be long remembered in this Presidency as the rule of a weak Government completely under the influence of official bureaucracy well known for its prejudices and therefore unpopular to the public at large. Under Lord Reay the officials did not enjoy this freedom and

by contrast Lord Harris was to them a King Log in the place of a King Stork. It is no wonder therefore that District officers and their European friends should do all in their power to honour a Governor who maintained the so-called prestige of the service. But to the people at large His Excellency's Government naturally appeared conservative, narrow-minded and unsympathetic and in bidding farewell to His Excellency we are sorry to say that he is leaving India as one of the most unpopular of the recent Governors of this Presidency.

10th February 1895.

DNYAN PRAKASH.

(ANGLO-VERNACULAR)

I

Whether an action should be in the civil courts against busy bodies extorting money from persons unwilling to pay for public entertainments was a question raised by His Excellency at Ahmedabad. We hardly know English manners. But we can assert that His Excellency is the last person that should raise such a question. Suppose a gentleman refuses to entertain an unwelcome guest; is the latter justified in passing strictures on the inhospitality of the host?

There are lacs of people in this Presidency who do not like to pay a single farthing to entertain a Governor who has not only not done anything for their advancement, but on the contrary has been a drag upon their progress. Suppose a few grasshoppers busy themselves with raising subscriptions, and in doing so extort money from a person unwilling to pay we do not see why an action should not lie against such persons. But His Excellency thinks otherwise.

The Eastern people are hospitable from times immemorial and they do not require any advice from His Excellency in such matters. They know the use and abuse of hospitality.

If the law of the land is favourable for such actions against the extorting persons His Excellency thinks it wise and proper to pass an Act prohibiting such actions. How beautiful would such an Act look on the Statute Book!! Would it not be the finishing stroke of Lord Harris in his immortal career in the Bombay Presidency?

We are reminded of a verse of Bhartrihari which says, "The Creator has created *silence* as a mark for ignorance and it becomes an ornament especially to the illiterate in the assembly of the wise."

12th November 1894.

II

So they are going to get up a movement to raise a memorial in honour of Lord Harris ! What a pity there should be found people wishing to perpetuate the memory of a man who not only did not do anything to brighten the life of his subjects nor lighten their sufferings, but either through the weakness of his mind or his tendency to be led by his immediate subordinates, rendered his administration nothing but a failure ! What did Lord Harris do during the last five years of his regime that people should come forward to raise a memorial in his honour ? Messrs S. F. Beaufort and N. N. Wadia may be his personal friends and admirers, but we really see no reason why they need must go and send a circular to the native princes and chiefs requesting them to subscribe to a fund for raising a memorial to His Excellency Lord Harris. Of course the Native princes cannot say 'no' and we are sure that a statue or some such memorial will soon be raised to the memory of Lord Harris' regime here to stare at us at Bombay. But people do understand how much to value such memorials. Messrs. Beaufort and Wadia knew well that their efforts to raise such a memorial fund by requesting the public to subscribe, would meet with no response and hence their sending a circular to the princes and chiefs who, they are sure, cannot but pay their quota towards the fund. It is our duty now to strongly, boldly and honestly oppose this movement. Public opinion ought to make an advance by showing a bold front at this time. Will there not be found one chief or prince in our Presidency who would stand boldly and refuse to pay towards the fund ? We are sure that the promoters of this "Harris Memorial" fund will scarcely have any response from the General public. But simply keeping away from the movement would not be of any great use. People must boldly show that they disapprove of the idea of such a memorial. We hope that our Local Sabha and the Bombay Presidency Association will not be tardy in boldly ventilating public opinion on this point. Never did Lord Harris respect the opinion of the people, it is no wonder therefore that they do not wish to respect the memory of his regime by raising a memorial.

10th December 1894.

III

ENTERTAINMENT TO LORD HARRIS.

We learn from the Bombay dailies that a meeting of a few persons was called by friends and admirers of Lord Harris, at the residence

of Khan Bahadur M. C. Murzban, to pass certain resolutions with regard to the entertainment, proposed to be given to Lord Harris, for the encouragement he has given to physical education in this Presidency. The object of the meeting, if strictly pursued so as not to associate his administration with it, is certainly not objectionable. But the public is justified in raising its voice in protest if it be associated with the administration of Lord Harris. For Lord Harris as a cricketer is a person quite different from Lord Harris as an administrator of this Presidency. Dr. Bahadurjee was right when he made a protest against any public character being given to it on this very ground. But he was ruled out of order for raising a dissentient voice. This was of course illegal. Again whether a meeting consisting of 45 men out of whom there were 7 Hindus, 18 Mussalmans and the rest Parsees, can be called a public meeting is a matter of doubt. We believe this meeting had been called to consider the ways and means with a direct view of collecting subscriptions for the public memorial to the parting Governor under the pretext of the avowed object viz., to consider the proposal of giving an entertainment to him for his efforts in the cause of physical education. We do not know whether the leaders of this movement have been so blinded by their over-admiration for Lord Harris, as not to know that the public feeling is quite against such a demonstration. We make a suggestion to such gentlemen who wish a memorial for Lord Harris that each of them should seize an early opportunity of erecting a statue in front of his door, that the memory of their departing friend may ever live fresh in their minds and that the succeeding generations may know that they had done their duty towards their benefactor amidst the stormy opposition of the unfeeling many.

14th January 1895.

IV

THE HARRIS MEMORIAL MOVEMENT.

It is certainly quite amusing to see the progress of this movement. It is a struggle between the moneyed admirers of Lord Harris and the general public of the Presidency. We have not the least doubt that the first will get success so far as to erect a statue or some such thing in memory of Lord Harris, but have they considered well whether that will really be a memorial in the best sense of the word? What will that

memorial remind the public of? Are Lord Harris's admirers quite sure that the words which they will take care to get inscribed upon the pedestal of the statue (for we have no doubt that the memorial will take the form of a statue) will be believed by the people? Have they not a object lesson to teach them otherwise in the statue of Sir Richard Temple? Will the people take that inscription extolling the virtues and good deeds of Lord Harris even as seriously as people who visit a cemetery take the inscriptions on tombstones? We leave the promoters of the memorial movement to answer these questions as best they could. That the General public is quite opposed to the movement even a child can tell. That the movement is being strongly protested against, nobody can deny? But has the work of protesting gone too far? Did the members of the corporation of Bombay show a very good spirit by protesting against lending the Corporation Hall for a meeting of the promoters of the memorial movement? Our contemporary of the Indian Spectator has raised these questions and he accuses the protesting members with want of toleration. But we fail to see how he can support his accusations. We are of opinion that the protesting members hit upon a very important point when they protested against Mr. Acworth's agreeing to lend the Hall to the promoters of the movement. Their action can be defended upon two grounds. First, that it would have been quite a wrong precedent. The Municipal Commissioner has really no authority to lend the Hall of the Corporation without first consulting the members. Did not the members therefore do well in warning the Commissioner against usurping a power which no law or bye-law of the Corporation ever gave him? The second ground on which we support the action of the protesting members is that allowing the use of the Hall for such a movement, would have given it the appearance of having secured the approval of the Corporation. Government have so many times refused to let to public use the Town Hall of Bombay apparently on the principle, that letting the Hall for purposes which have no approval from Government may lead the people to think that Government is favourable to them. We are sure, Government never thought that refusing to lend the Town Hall would prevent the people from having their meetings. So are we sure that the protesting members never thought their protest would prevent the promoters of the memorial movement from having their meeting at all. The protest was made on principle and we believe that that was a right stand. Our contemporary says that the criterion of unanimous public opinion cannot always be depended upon, because unanimity of opinion can

scarcely be found in India. We fully agree with our contemporary in this remark of his but at the same time we beg to draw his attention to the fact that there is something like public opinion which means the opinion of an overwhelming majority. Is there any doubt that the memorial movement is the work of the few who are in no way representatives of the people. The people have derived no benefit from Lord Harris's rule—on the contrary they have every reason to believe that he always took care to show complete disregard to their welfare and act always in opposition to even their unanimous wishes and voice. If the princes and chiefs have found in him a very great benefactor and if his Native and European friends have found in him a very congenial friend they are quite welcome to raise a memorial. What the public and their representatives seem so anxious to do is that the movement should not be interpreted as a public movement, and hence the strong protests. Could not the promoters of the movement have got any other suitable hall, the private property of some millionaire in Bombay to hold their meeting? They could certainly have done that. But they would not do that for the simple reason that they wanted to give the whole affair an appearance of a heartily got up public movement. Who is to blame then if the people protested rather too strongly! If the promoters had not deemed it necessary to make out that their movement had the support of the public, if they had chosen to do what they are bent upon doing quite gently, we are sure there would never have risen such a storm of protests. The promoters have we think to thank themselves for the wild uproar against their movement, and for having been the instrument of putting Lord Harris in a very strange position.

24th January 1895.

V

LORD HARRIS MEMORIAL.

We are very glad that the admirers and friends of Lord Harris have at last thought wisely and declared openly that the memorial movement and the meetings connected with it were not at all public. If wise counsels had prevailed from the first, we are sure, matters would not have gone to the length to which they subsequently went. Whether rightly or wrongly, we need not say, but the general bulk of the people of the Presidency are not at all satisfied with Lord Harris' administration. They are not only not satisfied, but are positively dissatisfied. How was it then possible for anybody to coax them to ignore a movement which tried to

cherish the memory of one who completely failed as a Governor? His geniality of nature and his being a thorough gentleman and a champion cricketer, are all right. But those are certainly not the qualities which common people could appreciate. Their question is, "what has he done for us?" The answer to which is certainly far from being satisfactory. However, we need not discuss this question any further. The memorial-makers themselves have confessed that their movement is not a public movement. It is a movement set on foot by the personal friends and admirers of Lord Harris. This confession once made, we think we ought to allow them to go their way quietly.

4th February 1895.

AMRITA BAZAAR PATRIKA.

(ENGLISH)

I

An esteemed friend writes to us from Bombay: "You are doing yeoman's service to our friends at Poona. The Government of Lord Harris has already been discredited, and yet there are people who are stealthily endeavouring to raise subscriptions for his statue. One, a Mahomedan gentleman, and another, a Parsee, are moving in the matter. J. H. the Bhoynuggur Thakore is, I hear, going to head the list." We think, Lord Harris should get a statue, for, has not his Government done its best to harm the people? That is the rule in India. In other countries statues are reserved for those who serve humanity; here, he who can rule the people with a rod in hand, is entitled to such an honor. Is it not so? Just imagine that a lakh of rupees has been raised to commemorate the rule of Lord Lansdowne, who beat hollow even Lord Lytton, the worst of Governors-General that was ever sent to rule this country! And while a statue has been voted to Lord Lansdowne, there is no memorial to show that a good Englishman like Lord Ripon came to govern the Indians! Those who, like our esteemed friend at Bombay, are indignant at the proposal of a statue for a Governor like Lord Harris, ought to console themselves with these thoughts: In other countries, a statue represents the heart of the nation; in India, as a rule, it means an inroad upon the pockets of some unfortunate princes and noblemen, who, poor fellows, are more the objects of pity than of anger. And then, a Governor,

however bad he may be, hankers after expressions of good will from his people, as his rule draws to a close. Lord Lansdowne, on the eve of his departure from these shores, besought some of his personal friends to secure for him at least one valedictory address from a public body. And there is no doubt, that he would have greatly preferred this one address from the people to the grand statue which has been prepared for him by fleecing some helpless Indian princes. It is quite true Lord Ripon got no statue; but addresses were rained down upon him, while his image lies imprinted in the heart of the Indian nation. And who is the happier,—Lord Ripon or Lord Lansdowne—one whose memory is cherished with gratitude from one end of the country to the other, or one who leaves a stone or bronze image behind him, to remind the people of his iron rule? Let Lord Harris have his statue, but let the people stand aloof from the movement. Then only, will his statue be rated at its true worth; and its value cannot be over a lakh of rupees; for, this amount has not been raised even for the memorial of Lord Lansdowne, though the whole body of officialdom were set in motion to collect subscriptions for it. And when Lord Harris is gone, the people will point at the statue, and remark: “Here is the image of one who came to rule us and whose duty it was to govern us well. His record of service was, however, quite blank and he, therefore, failed to carry the good wishes of the people with him. The only reward he got was this statue, which cost the country a few thousand pounds; but, not a farthing of the amount was paid voluntarily by a single Indian. At any event his reward was only a few thousand pounds, even which he would not have got, if many of those who contributed to the fund, were left free.

5th November 1894.

II

THE *Hindi Punch* has “a study of H. E. the Governor’s feet while touring in the ‘Deccan,’ the Governor being, of course, Lord Harris. Only His Lordship’s boots are given, the bottoms of which are marked “threats” and “rebuffs.” These gubernatorial tours present now-a-days strange spectacles. In days gone by, the tour of a Governor was hailed with delight by the people, and the Governor entered into the midst of the people, with a heart overflowing with royal feelings. The tour cemented the friendship between the rulers and the ruled. Tours mean advantage to the rulers and loss to the people. Indeed, it is suspected that some rulers at least toured only because they could by that means replenish their purses. In these days wherever the visit of the august

personage is announced, the Magistrate sends for the leading men of the district, for the purpose of organizing a reception committee. The leading men are permitted only to contribute money, but to do nothing else. The Magistrate does everything himself, even the drafting of the address. He, as a general rule, makes the people say whatever he thinks would please the ruler of the Province. The ruler is *feted* and a large amount of money of the people is expended. It now comes the turn of the Governor to repay his hosts. Now, if the officials are in charge of every department, the Municipalities are under some control of the natives of the soil. The Governor, therefore, avoids every other department and selects this particular department for his fierce remarks. Now-a-days some Governors have found another opportunity of having a fling at their hosts, *viz.*, the occurrence of the riots. In his tours Lord Harris told the people that they had become insubordinate, inconsiderate, lawless and what not. But if Lord Harris has his own opinion about the riots, Mr. Rees has made the ethics of these disturbances exceedingly clear. "An acute Mahomedan gentleman", says the *Lahore Tribune*, "recently said, in reply to a question put to him on the subject, that there was no quarrel between Hindus and Mahomedans, but the quarrel was really between the Government and the Hindus."

And this is what the Lucknow *Advocate* says.—

We have fallen in evil days. Things of rare occurrence even under Mahomedan rule seem to be the order of the day. Riots between Hindus and Mahomedans have become chronic. And Government do not prescribe any prophylactic medicine for this untoward disruption in the Indian people. Partiality is the watchword of every officer. The Hindus have been maltreated to a provoking extent.

A Bombay paper asked to know the proof of the allegation that the officials, generally speaking were favouring one community against another. Well, the proof is, everybody says so, that is all.

12th November 1894.

III

LORD HARRIS.

The people of Bombay are very much exercised over the proposed statue to Lord Harris; and we have been asked by friends to condemn the project. We shall express our views on the subject presently. Any one can secure a statue for himself by spending some money. Nobody can thus prevent the friends of Lord Harris to collect, say Rs. 50,000 for

preparing a statue for him and then placing it afterwards in some corner of the city of Bombay. If they cannot raise such an amount, they may ask His Lordship to open his private pursestrings and make up the deficiency, and he would no doubt most gladly do it, if for nothing else but to oblige his admirers who are doing so much for him. Anyhow, it is the easiest thing for the admirers of a reigning Governor to get a statue for him, specially if he is in good odour with his subordinate officials. They have simply to issue an appeal for money to the big wigs of the country who bask in the sunshine of Government favours, and the necessary fund would be at once forth coming. Bombay is studded with Native States and their helpless rulers have been appealed to for money. The proposed statue is thus already practically a *fait accompli*. When a statue is secured to a retiring Governor, it thus means nothing particular. What the people of Bombay have to see, however, is that their Governor does not get any valedictory address from them. Circumstanced as the Indians are, the power of giving or not giving an address to a retiring Viceroy or Governor, is the only substitute for their lack of voice in respect of his appointment and his administration. In other countries, people have a share, more or less, in settling the individual who, as chief minister, is to guide their destinies. In India, the people have absolutely no share in this question. In other countries, they have, more or less, a voice in controlling and checking his actions. In India people have none of it.

But, under the merciful providence of a Supreme Being, what the ruling race denies to a nation, Nature, to a certain extent, makes it up, in some shape or other. Thus it is that the people of India have got the power of showing their pleasure or displeasure with the acts of a Governor, in the shape of wishing him a sincere Godspeed or not, at the end of his administration. This is, no doubt, a very limited and small power. But, this is all they have and so they cannot afford to abuse it. The exercise of this power is a sacred responsibility. It is under the heavy weight of such a feeling that the leaders in the Bombay Presidency should think it their duty to warn individuals not to regard the matter of giving addresses to their retiring Governor as one of formality or ordinary civility.

It is a matter of great sorrow to an Indian not to be able to say a good word to a ruler who is about to bid farewell to his nation and country. Every Indian would wish that he could sincerely and cordially pass his benediction upon an individual, who, for a considerable time, has been working in his country, and working with a great amount of

trouble and anxiety too. But how can he help it if he finds it impossible to do so? When Lord Harris came to Bombay, the people of that Presidency entertained great hopes of him. Personally, he is an exceedingly amiable and genially disposed nobleman. An amiable disposition is greatly valued by the Indian nation. But the Governor of a vast Province is required to possess a great many other qualifications besides amiability of disposition.

Now, what are the duties of an Indian Governor? One of his duties is, no doubt, to see that nothing occurs to shake the rule of the Queen, and that the Empire be preserved intact. But another part of his duty, and none the less important,—is to secure the welfare of the people entrusted to his charge. The two duties are in fact identical, and it requires no demonstration to show that they are so. The ruler of an Indian Province is at once the protector of the English rule, and the protector of the people. In short, when the people are loyal his only duty is to advance their welfare. Although not chosen by them, a good Governor cannot but help feeling that God has placed him in a position which requires him not only to do justice to them, but to advocate their interests even when they clash against those of his own countrymen.

Now, what does the history of the last four years of Lord Harris's Government show? Can the friends and admirers of His Lordship name one good act for which he can claim gratitude from the people of Bombay? On the other hand, is it not a fact that the subordinates of His Excellency, taking advantage of his good nature, have done their very best to humiliate the Hindus in all possible manner and create a feeling of unrest in the country?

It is quite plain that Lord Harris himself is anxious for an address; and the question naturally occurs, that if his Lordship had any regard for Indian opinion, why did he not do *something* to deserve it? How can one give him an address without enumerating his good works? But what are they? Have the friends of Lord Harris, who are making such gigantic efforts to secure both a statue and an address for His Lordship, taken the simple fact into their consideration that an address must contain an enumeration of the blessings that His Lordship has conferred on the people? Now, if you do not enumerate them, the address becomes an insult; and the Governor, as the Representative of the Queen, cannot accept it. Surely, His Excellency has self-respect enough to reject an address which couched in however sweet language, is devoid of substance.

Then again, it is very unreasonable on the part of Lord Harris to expect an address from the Hindus, whom, like Sir Charles Elliott, he has never lost an opportunity of abusing to his heart's content. Now, is it not unnatural that you will humiliate one and then claim gratitude from him? Nay, Lord Harris did more. During his last tour, while some of his officials were manufacturing false cases against the Poona Brahmins and trying their very best to blacken their character in the eyes of the world, he joined the chorus raised by his subordinates and heaped insults after insults upon the unfortunate Hindus of Poona, by calling them lawless rioters and holding out threats to them, though the cases in which they were involved, were yet pending before a Judicial Court. It reflects great honour upon Mr. Jacob, the Sessions Judge, who tried the cases, that he was not in any way influenced by these utterances of the Governor, upon whose good or bad opinion depended his future prospects: but, if Mr. Jacob was not influenced, that does not excuse Lord Harris from assuming an attitude which was calculated to do the Hindus immense harm, indeed, ruin them for ever in the estimation of the world. It is really an extraordinary spectacle that, after having done such grievous wrong to the Hindus, he would expect a valedictory address from them!

Our humble advice to the people of Bombay then is this. They must not abuse the sacred privilege of address-giving by voting an address to Lord Harris. He does not deserve one. Of course, his friends and admirers may not only give him one, but also erect a statue for him. Nay, the European friends of His Excellency can also extort an address and statue by sheer brute force. They are, however, quite welcome to it: for we know, some of our men, who pose as representatives, cannot resist influential Europeans. The public of Bombay cannot prevent this, but, they are bound to see that those who are really people's representatives, do not join such a movement. In short, they must make it quite clear that when Lord Harris leaves their shores, he will have to do it without evoking one expression of regret in the minds of the nation over whom he came to rule.

6th December 1894.

IV

We shall again quote the following sentences from the article on Affairs in the *Times*:—

Lord Harris's farewell speeches of warning and rebuke, although honourable to his frankness have not been generally accepted by his

countrymen as the satisfactory method of treatment. Deeds, not words must govern India, and constrain its naturally hostile creeds to observe the armistice imposed by British rule.

So, even the *Times*, the out-and-out supporter of Lord Harris, has been disgusted with his Lordship and thrown him overboard! Perhaps, his Lordship has been found out. His amiability and good intentions are admitted by all. But, what we want in India, are able men, who have the capacity of taking a comprehensive view of questions, and acting with firmness, softened with sympathy. Lord Lansdowne and Lord Harris appear to be cast in the same mould. The fact is, and it is idle to conceal it, that they are men quite incompetent to rule the destinies of nations. We are really alarmed to learn that there is a chance of Lord Lansdowne coming to the India Office. We hope, for the good of humanity and the Empire, no such thing would come about. Lord Lansdowne's advent to the India Office would give the signal for deep and wide-spread discontent, all over India. What we want now is peace, the healing up of breaches, and the establishment of brotherhood. We do not want war. We are tired of it. We have had enough of the Lansdowne policy. We hope, the British people will, in their infinite mercy, save us from the dire misfortune of another instalment of that commodity.

17th December 1894.

V

The friends and admirers of Lord Harris have at last come to realize, that, it is not so easy a task to secure a public address and a statue for the retiring Governor as they at first took it to be. They have therefore practically given up the idea, and are now quietly raising some money privately for the purpose of commemorating his memory in some humble way. This will be indeed a very melancholy satisfaction to Lord Harris; for it is no longer a secret that he is hankering after a statue and a valedictory address from the public. Sir Charles Elliott is more wise. The time of His Honour's departure is drawing nigh; but, as he has no hope of getting an address, much less a statue, from the public here, he is apparently quite content with the proposal started by the *Englishman* namely, that a small fund should be raised from among his own countrymen in Bengal to commemorate the memory of Lady Elliott, who, we hear, has been a very good hostess to them. This reminds us of the addresses which were presented to Lord Dufferin by some of our Mofussil public

bodies when he had latterly become unpopular in consequence of his anti-Congress tendencies. In those addresses, they heaped praise upon Lady Dufferin for her good feelings towards the people of this country, and congratulated His Lordship on having possessed such a good wife! Well, if Lord Harris is so anxious to secure the good opinions of the people over whom he came to rule, why did he not treat them as a *ma bap* should do his children? But what has he done in fact? The victims of the Bombay riots, who are rotting in the jail, cannot bless him. Many of these men were peaceful and law-abiding inhabitants, and earned livelihood for themselves and their families by hard labour. They lost their head, temporarily and committed lawlessness, for which they no doubt deserved punishment. But are not rioters to be found in England also? There, however, they rarely rot in jails. An appeal has been made to Lord Harris on behalf of these rioters; but, up to this time, he has shown no sign to exercise his prerogative of mercy in their favour. The persecution of the Wai and the Poona gentlemen is also a matter which is not likely to soften the hearts of the public towards His Lordship. The Parsees will ever remember the Tower scandal, while the Maharattas cannot forget the Ahmednagore speech, in which they were complimented with the epithet of law-breakers, or *budmashes*, by their *ma bap*. Lord Harris has, however, one qualification, namely, he is a good cricket player. Some wag therefore, facetiously suggested that His Lordship should not be allowed to leave the shores of Bombay without an address from the cricketers; and, His Lordship's friends and admirers actually took the idea seriously and held a preliminary meeting the other day at the bungalow of one of them, and sought to pass a resolution to the following effect:—

That this meeting is of opinion that a public entertainment be given to H. E. Lord Harris for the great encouragement given to physical education, cricket and sports generally; and that a cricket challenge shield bearing the name of Lord Harris be obtained and competed for annually in such manner as may hereafter be determined.

Dr. K. N. Bahadurji was, however, present at the meeting, and he entered a protest. He said that Lord Harris as Governor was one, and Lord Harris as cricketer was another. The resolution goes to show that Lord Harris was a friend of physical education in the Presidency: what he really was, however, that he was himself a good player and he was a friend of those who could play like himself. And, then again, the meeting was not competent to pass a resolution of the kind at all, as not even ten per cent. of the gathering represented the sporting class. Dr. Bahadurji was, however, not listened to and the resolution was formally

passed. But his protest has done its work. As we said above, the idea of raising a statue has been abandoned, but subscriptions will be canvassed privately and then a meeting of the *private subscribers only* will be held to determine the form of the memorial. In short, Lord Harris has been practically thrown overboard by his friends, who seem to have been thoroughly disconcerted as the following incident will show. On the evening of the 4th January, there was to be a motion in the Bombay Senate to alter the date of the Convocation to enable Lord Harris to give the Convocation speech; but, a rumour was circulated to the effect that, Dr Bahadurji and his party were bent on doing mischief by opposing the motion, and it was immediately withdrawn! The protest of the Bombay Municipal Commissioners, headed by Mr. Wacha, against the use of the Municipal Hall for the preliminary meeting in connection with the proposed Lord Harris' memorial, without the sanction of the Corporation, also shows to what pass have things come.

20th January 1895.

VII

The reader is aware that the idea of holding a public meeting in honor of Lord Harris has been given up. It will be now a meeting of the "friends and admirers" of the Governor! This is all right, and the friends and admirers of Lord Harris may now praise him to their heart's content. By the way, the public is perhaps not aware how this meeting of "the friends and admirers" of a retiring ruler of this country came into existence. When Lord Northbrook was leaving India, a public meeting was held in the Town Hall of Calcutta to vote an address to that Indian Viceroy. Babu Sambhu Chandra Mukerjee and nine other gentlemen, however, came forward to enter a protest against the policy of the Northbrook Government regarding the deposition of the ex-Gaikwar, Mulhar Row. Nobody knew anything about this bomb shell; and nobody expected that anybody would have the hardihood to raise his voice against the proposal of giving a public address to a Viceroy, specially when Sir Richard Temple, the then Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, was presiding. However, the Rev. K. M. Bannerjee came to the rescue. He proposed that the sense of the meeting should be taken, which was done, and Babu Sambhu Chandra Mukerjee and his party were not allowed to speak. Their protest, however had its effect upon those who are so fond of voting valedictory addresses to departing rulers. After Lord Northbrook, came the turn of Sir Ashley

Eden to receive an address from some of the zemindars of Bengal and Behar, because, as Lieutenant-Governor, he had done their class and the agriculturists generally the greatest mischief possible, by imposing the Public Works Cess in this Province. Well, when these Zemindars sat in secret conclave to devise the plan of securing a successful public meeting to vote an address to Sir Ashley, they were haunted by the spectres of some greater men than Babu Shambhu Chander, who had openly threatened to swamp any meeting that might be called in the name of the public to honor the retiring Lieutenant-Governor. Then a happy idea occurred to one of the friends of Sir Ashley Eden, who were so anxious to give him a good certificate, though he had done his best to injure the interests of their country in various ways. "Why not", suggested this friend, "call this meeting a meeting of friends and admirers? By this means we shall be able to keep away the discontent element. When any one enters the meeting hall, he may be asked whether he is a friend or a foe. If he is a friend we allow him to come, if he is a foe we ask him to leave the place." The idea was very much relished, and an advertisement to the following effect was published in all papers. "A public meeting of the friends and admirers of Sir Ashley Eden will be held to consider &c." The advertisement concluded with these significant words: "None need attend the meeting who is not a friend and admirer of Sir Ashley Eden." The promoters of the meeting were thus left to themselves and to praise their idol without opposition. The friends and admirers of Lord Harris have also acted wisely by having resorted to this method to overcome the difficulty in their way. Nobody will now grudge Lord Harris even a golden statue.

27th January 1895.

VIII.

The Harris memorial is now an accomplished fact. It is not a difficult feat that has been accomplished however. The friends and admirers of Lord Harris met and voted him a memorial. There is nothing to prevent the friends and admirers of any man to vote him even a golden statue. The difficult part of the feat was, however, the collection of funds. This difficulty was obviated by appealing to those unfortunate creatures, the Indian princes in Bombay. There was another difficult feat which the admirers and friends voluntarily took upon themselves to accomplish. It was to justify their action. Now, we do not think this was necessary. If a memorial had been voted in the name of the public, such an explanation might have been necessary. But it was voted by friends

and admirers ; and that being the case, there was no necessity for them to go to justify themselves for their action in this connection. Yet "the friends and admirers" did it,—perhaps they were ill at ease,—they felt that they were not doing what would secure them public approbation. And thus they volunteered an explanation. They said that Lord Harris deserved a memorial because no one could please all. Here is an admission that Lord Harris displeased some. That he pleased any is founded only upon the testimony of his friends and admirers—a testimony which must be inadmissible. Another friend and admirer said that had his Lordship been able to conceal his thoughts, he might have given universal satisfaction. Lord Harris laid his heart bare, say the friends and admirers, and so he incurred the bad opinion of the people. If His Lordship, say the friends and admirers, had kept his heart to himself, he might have been more popular ! This means that the heart of Lord Harris is as black as ink, and when his Lordship laid it bare the people were shocked to see it ! Is it so ? The fact is, when a retiring Governor has to seek a certificate of good character from his friends and admirers which the general public will not give, he only emphasises his own failure.

10th February 1895.

IX

The worst thing that the friends of an unpopular ruler in India can do for him, is to present him before the public for a certificate. It is also a psychological phenomenon, inexplicably mysterious, to see such a ruler coming forward before the public to claim one. A ruler in India, who has not been able to give satisfaction to or has offended the people under his jurisdiction by his acts or measures, ought to be able to realise it. Knowing this, whence comes this assurance to lead him to come forward for an address praising his administration ? We saw this spectacle presented by Lord Lansdowne, and we see the same thing being done just now by Lord Harris. Did not Lord Lansdowne know that his rule had caused the deepest discontent in the land ? Did he see even one Indian paper ever upholding any of his measures or acts ? Did he, in fact, ever do anything which could elicit the thanks of the Indian nation ? His Lordship saw with his own eyes that the Indian papers in a chorus, condemned his administration, from the top to the bottom, and from beginning to the end. He also must have felt in his heart of hearts, that there was nothing in his rule, to entitle him to any thanks from the people of India. Yet his Lordship came to Calcutta from Simla, and stayed here for about

two weeks in the hope of getting an address from the Indians. His Lordship, however, got none !

In the same manner Lord Harris is claiming a certificate. Lord Harris is only a smaller edition of Lord Lansdowne, that is all. It is to us a mystery how he was persuaded to entertain the notion that the Natives of Bombay would come forward to praise his administration. Lord Harris's friends have done him this mischief that they have caused His Lordship's administration to be subjected to a severe criticism, and have made his life miserable at the end of his rule. His Lordship has been fried in boiling oil, and this is due solely to the injudicious actions of his friends. The greatest mischief that they have done is to shew to the world that, the administration of Lord Harris has caused so intense dissatisfaction, that they could not, inspite of all their efforts, procure a certificate for the retiring ruler in a country, where the people have not that independent spirit which free men have. Rulers who have a liking for the good opinion of the people under their rule, ought always to bear that fact in mind, from the very beginning of their administration. To forget it all along, and to remember it only at the end, can possibly do no good.

10th February 1895.

X

The "friends and admirers" at last sat to do Lord Harris honour. One who attended the Poona meeting was asked about its character, and he replied as follows :—

My dear—:The meeting was invited by a private circular by two friends and was attended by about fifteen gentlemen. I did not go there in any representative capacity. Yours &c.

We take the above letter from *the Mahratta*. This private conference was, however, magnified into an awful Representative Meeting by the *Times of India*, which paper thus describes it :—

A meeting of the principal representatives of the Hindoo, Parsee, and Mahomedan communities of Poona, among whom were the Honourable Sirdar Khan Bahadoor Dorabjee Pudemji, Khan Bahadoor M. C. Dotiwala, Rao Bahadoors Doctor Bhandarkar, V. M. Bidie, Coopooswamy Viziarungam Mudljar, G. G. Gokhale, Rao Saheb Balcrishna shyama, Messrs. Abdulla Abdulwahed, Adurjee Dorabjee Ghaswala, D. D. Boottee, Byramjee D. Padamjee, Bomonjee D. Padamjee, &c., was held this even-

ing at Khan Bahadoor Dorabjee Padamjee's residence, Bhowanipet, for the purpose of considering the feasibility of raising a fund in Poona to augment the one being raised in Bombay for a memorial to Lord Harris. Dr. Bhandarkar was voted to the chair.

One of these fifteen was a Hindu of note, Dr. Bhandarkar. The latter made himself notorious during the agitation which followed the Consent Act. Dr. Bhandarkar adds another feather to his cap. It is such acts which make the Hindus contemptible.

Since the above was in type, some details of the Harris Memorial meeting, held at the Bombay Town Hall on the 29th ultimo, have reached us. Like the Poona meeting it has been characterised by the local daily papers as "a large, representative and enthusiastic meeting." As a matter of fact, however, it was only a meeting of "Dharamsi" and "Morunsi, and it was almost entirely boycotted by the leaders of the Hindu Community in Bombay. Only two Hindus took part in it, and they had to be imported from Poona! Of course, the irrepressible Dr. Bhandarkar was one of them; and as expected, he outdid everybody in praising the retiring Governor. According to Dr. Bhandarkar, one Governor "had especially favoured higher education to the detriment of primary, others had favoured primary education at the expense of the higher, and others again (poor Lord Reay) had gone in for technical education at the expense of both. Lord Harris had devoted equal attention to all." Dr. Bhandarkar should have remembered the Governors who were to come after Lord Harris. Five years will soon pass and he should have kept some of his gushing loyalty for Lord Sandhurst when his time for departure from this country would come. Dr. Bhandarkar was, however, too clever by half, when he uttered the following words:—"This is a meeting of the friends and admirers of Lord Harris. It would have been a meeting of the general public of Bombay, if His Excellency had been a pupil of Talleyrand and acted on the principle that language is given to man to conceal his thought. Well, if language was not given to conceal thoughts, it was also not given to Governors of Provinces to abuse and insult others. Thus, one of the most fulsome admirers of Lord Harris admitted that the general community of Bombay had nothing to do with the demonstration, and he had not the intelligence to understand that, by this admission he was taking away the value of all the praises which he and other admirers had showered upon Lord Harris at the meeting.

10th February 1895.

THE INDIAN MIRROR.

(*ENGLISH.*)

I

THE PROPOSED TESTIMONIAL TO LORD HARRIS, THE RETIRING GOVERNOR OF BOMBAY.

Now-a-days, Viceroy, Governors, and Lieutenant-Governors, may depart "unwept, unhonoured, and unsung," but thanks to the zeal of their "friends and admirers," they are sure to leave "monumental stones" behind them. We beg their pardon—we should have said, Memorial statues. All of us know the history of the Lausdowne Memorial Fund, how skilfully the Indian Princes were approached, and how the Memorial was given a public shape without even the formality of a public meeting. The scandal has scarcely died out when another is about to break forth, this time in Western India. The term of office of the Governor of Bombay will expire in a very few months. Of the successive Governors that ruled Bombay, not one has succeeded in achieving such monumental unpopularity among the general community in that Presidency as Lord Harris. Even Sir Phillip Wodehouse was better loved than he. The record of Lord Harris in his gubernatorial capacity is a blank as regards good and beneficent acts and measures. Of mischievous speeches and mischievous acts, it has been very full. The closing months of his administration have thoroughly exposed his utter lack of statesmanship, ill-balanced mind, want of discretion and tact, and absence of a calm, impartial and judicial judgment. And towards this exposure, Lord Harris has himself materially contributed by being not a man of "few words," but of infinite babbling. The speeches, delivered by His Excellency in the Deccan, have helped to rend whatever reputation, he might have enjoyed, to tatters. His Excellency is also proved to have a bad temper, under the influence of which he will say nasty things of people without a reference to the truth of his accusations or otherwise. We should not be far wrong in assuming that Lord Harris will leave India unregretted except, perhaps, by a handful of cricketers. But even Lord Harris has his friends and admirers; and, indeed, what

official, in the enjoyment of substantial power, has not? In this case, the friends and admirers who have undertaken to present Bombay with a statue of Lord Harris as a memento of his beneficent rule, number two, one of them being a Parsi, the other a European. The Parsi is an Engineer in or Secretary to, some cotton mill. His name is the Hon'ble N. N. Wadia. He was raised from obscurity, during the closing period of his administration, by Lord Reay, to whom he was able to render some assistance in the establishment of the Technical Institute. Mr. Wadia's ambition in the local Legislative Council has been confined to quietly supporting official measures, notably those relating to Ahkari. Of the European gentleman, Mr. Beaufort, we know really nothing. Well, these two have approached the Chiefs in the Western Presidency with a private circular which the Bombay papers have got hold of, and from one of which we extract it today in another column. The circular, on the face of it, is a slipshod document in style and composition. The circular takes it for granted that "there is a general desire on the part of the various communities to testify fitly before his (Lord Harris's) departure, to the high and sincere esteem in which His Excellency is held." That is all Messrs. Beaufort and Wadia have to say in regard to His Excellency's claims on the gratitude of the Bombay Chiefs. No, we are wrong. There is yet another claim. All those "whose privilege is to come across him" have been "struck" with his "straightforward and manly intercourse." It is difficult to understand what the authors of the circular drive at. And because of the straightforward and manly *intercourse* (a word of doubtful meaning, is it not?) on the part of Lord Harris with all those who have come *across* him, the Chiefs are expected to contribute towards the expenses of a permanent Memorial to His Excellency; and they are advised, that as soon as their favourable answers have been received, a public meeting will be held. A public meeting of the people, or the Princes, the circular sayeth not. And this is the fashion in which irresponsible persons are allowed to bleed Indian Chiefs from time to time so that the public character of a retiring ruler may be white-washed. We need not comment at further length on this altogether wretched business. We should not be surprised, if, after this peculiar testimonial to Lord Harris, our own Lieutenant-Governor may be fired with the ambition to secure a similar honour for himself. He has only to express the wish, and accommodating friends and admirers will not be wanting to approach and take the hat round to our Maharajahs and Rajahs. Sir Charles Elliott, perhaps, may take the hint. It is invaluable.

30th November 1894.

II

THE DEPARTING GOVERNOR OF
BOMBAY.

It is well that the friends and admirers of Lord Harris should convene a meeting to do honour to His Excellency on the eve of his laying down his office. We would not grudge His Excellency any honour which the coterie of his friends, and those who are beholden to him for official favours, might wish to make, but no sense of delicacy should induce us to maintain silence, when a new colour is put upon such demonstration. We think, there ought to be no mistake about the real character of the meeting which was recently held in Bombay. The meeting was conspicuous by the absence of the leading men of the city, and even among the speakers there was lack of warmth in describing the qualities which entitle Lord Harris to their respect. The speakers, many of whom were officials, trained by tradition to do homage to the ruling head, drew, as might be expected, a brilliant portrait of His Excellency, but all their panegyrics could not invest the demonstration with particular importance. The mass of the people testified by their silence that they were of a different mind. They responded in a different tone to the invitation sent them, and it was a tone of uncompromising remonstrance to the movement got up by the zealous adherents of the departing Governor. We should very likely have seen a counter-demonstration, held in Bombay, if the faithful few had been less cautious in their manœuvres. They took time by the forelock, and wisely confined their movement to a limited circle. The result was just as it was anticipated. In the absence of the leading members of the Indian community, the meeting was held without the slightest enthusiasm. The retirement of a Governor is an event, fraught with immense interest to the people, but no interest, beyond active indifference, was displayed by them on the occasion. The meeting to commemorate the administration of Lord Harris was honoured neither by the people nor by their representatives. The leaders of the Indian society of Bombay, such as Sir Dinshaw Maneckji Petit, Sir Jamsetji Jijiboy, the Hon'ble Javerilal Umiashanker and others—did not take part in the proceedings of the meeting. Nor was the Mahomedan community particularly represented except by the Hon'ble Fazulbhoy Vishram. Some of them might have given their pecuniary aid, but that is no proof of their particular sympathy with the movement. Indeed, we

know very well how difficult it is to refuse when the hat is sent round. As regards the Indian Chiefs and Princes who have contributed donations to the memorial fund, their lot is very much to be pitied. They are unfortunate tools in the hands of officials, whom, willing or unwilling, they have to obey.

We are extremely sorry for Lord Harris. He assumed office at an unfortunate moment. He stepped into the shoes of a governor who, for his urbanity and high administrative qualities alike, was loved and respected by all classes of the Bombay community. The failings of Lord Harris appear the more prominent in sharp contrast with the unsullied reputation which Lord Reay enjoyed. He was, indeed, the best Governor Bombay had ever had excepting Sir Monstuart Elphinstone. Lord Harris has not been lacking in good points. His encouragement of physical training, his affability and *bon-homie* in the cricket field have rightly endeared him to those whose observation of his character has not penetrated beyond the sporting horizon. We are prepared also to admit that Lord Harris has been characterised by a candour which is seldom seen in officials. His candour has, perhaps, been the best feature of his character, even though it has sometimes erred on the wrong side. We must even give him his due by saying that, with all his faults, he has been superior to any of our Bengal and N. W. P. Civilians, with a few honourable exceptions. That clever tactic of speaking in riddles, which is a notorious characteristic of some of our officials, is not known to him. As a social companion, Lord Harris has been undoubtedly popular, but his geniality has done no good to the mass of people over whom he has held administrative sway.

We have done our best to draw a faithful portrait of the departing Governor of Bombay. We wish we could, on the eve of his departure from India, mingle our tears with those of his friends and admirers. But hard duty compels us to speak the truth, and we must confess that we part from His Excellency without grief. The unregretted retirement of Lord Harris presents a lamentable sight. It is pitiful to see a Governor going away from these shores, unsung and unhonoured by the people, who, by their tradition, by their religion, and by their very instinct, are taught to worship their rulers. It must be a source of great pain to the ruler himself to think in after-life that his departure from the country was, instead of being regretted, hailed with a positive sigh of relief by the people.

In conclusion, we must approve of His Excellency's choice in preferring a memorial which is likely to be of some advantage to the public. The many shortcomings of his administration will be mitigated, if not condoned, by this public benefit.

2nd February 1895.

HINDU PATRIOT.

(ENGLISH).

I

Twenty-five members of the Municipal Corporation of Bombay have signed a letter addressed to Mr. Acworth, the Municipal Commissioner, protesting against his conduct in having given the use of the Municipal Hall to the projectors of the Harris memorial for holding a preliminary meeting there—without any reference to the Corporation. The signatories are among the leading Municipal Councillors of Bombay and they deny that the head of the executive has any power to give the use of the Municipal Hall for such a purpose without any reference to the Corporation.

18th January 1895.

II

It is distressing to find Dr. Bhandarkar taking a leading part in the movement for raising a memorial to Lord Harris. The ostensible justification for the movement is the encouragement which Lord Harris has given to physical education. But the net has been cast sufficiently widely though Dr. Bhandarkar is the only Hindu public man of Bombay who appears to be specially active in his exertions to make the Harris Memorial Fund a success. Uncharitable people may impute motives to the learned doctor but surely Dr. Bhandarkar could not have failed to have noticed the distinctly anti-Hindu character of the policy which Lord Harris has almost defiantly pursued in Bombay. The Governor whose sole claim to the gratitude of his subjects consists in his enthusiastic devotion to physical education is about on a par with the Governor whose sole title to a memorial is his excellent fiddling.

26th January 1895.

III

The way the recent Poona meeting held in honour of Lord Harris has been trumpeted forth by the Anglo-Indian press affords only another illustration of that systematic misrepresentation which constitutes one of the principal weapons of certain journals which shall be nameless. It was trumpeted forth that the meeting was composed of all sections of

the Native community of Poona and was of a thoroughly representative character. It now appears that the meeting was held outside the city, convened by a private circular and attended by not more than fifteen persons, host and guests all told. So much for the representative character of the meeting.

31st January 1895.

IV

The "friends and admirers" of Lord Harris have held a meeting at the Town Hall of Bombay for the purpose of placing on record the deep sense of gratitude entertained by them for the services rendered to the Presidency by the departing Governor. It was, however a meeting of the European community and of a handful of Native gentlemen who were under personal obligation to His Excellency. The only Hindu gentleman who appears to have taken a prominent part at the meeting was Dr. Ram Krishna Gopal Bhandarkar, C. I. E., the Vice-Chancellor of the Bombay University. The other native speakers were two Mahomedans and a Parsi. Mr. Fazulbhai Visram is reported to have said at the meeting that "India would be all the better if *they* had a few more Governors and Governors-General for that matter, like Lord Harris." It would no doubt be all the better for others than Hindus who compose a preponderant majority of the population. Dr. Bhandarkar dwelt at some length upon the merits of Lord Harris' educational policy—a subject on which he is unquestionably competent to speak with authority. Dr. Hormusji alluded to the "just, righteous and impartial administration" of Lord Harris, conveniently ignoring the bitter persecution of the Hindus and the famous music circular which was aimed solely against the Hindus. As we said the other day, we are sorry to see Dr. Bhandarkar taking an active part in a movement of this character. We can respect the scholar but we are ashamed of the courtier. In Dr. Bhandarkar's case, it is difficult to understand where the scholar ends and the courtier begins.

1st February 1895.

THE MADRAS STANDARD.

(ENGLISH.)

THE HARRIS MEMORIAL.

I

The name of Lord Harris, the Governor of Bombay, will not be easily forgotten, not that any statue or some such memorial will serve to call back to memory the results of his five years' administration of the Western Presidency; but he has made the closing period of his rule memorable in a manner that is not altogether flattering to himself. Like his great prototype, Lord Lansdowne, the late Viceroy, Lord Harris has, especially towards the closing period of his Governorship, shown *an utter disregard for the opinions and interests of the native community*. To put it more plainly, he has not only set at naught the claims of the large majority of the population placed under his stewardship upon the sympathy of his Government but, in striking contrast to his immediate predecessor, he has always been in the hands of a clique of Anglo-Indian officials who have the highest contempt for the aspirations of the native population. The recent unfortunate riots in that Presidency supplied him with weapons with which to cudgel the natives into silence. During his farewell tour through the province, he has been discharging a volley of abuse upon the inhabitants of the cities and towns he visited in the name of sound admonitions and curiously enough, Sir William Hunter, in the pages of the *Times* characterised and signalised his speeches as teeming with wisdom and policy of a very high order. But these professions and certificates, we are glad to observe, have fallen flat upon the people who, though quick to forget and forgive, have very properly, in this instance, evinced their entire disapprobation of a rule which has been in no way a blessing to them. We have seen how, even when it was proposed to give an entertainment to Lord Harris for the encouragement he has given to physical education, Dr. Bahadurji protested that a popular colour should not be imparted to the movement, and that the entertainment should only be of a purely social character, devoid of any, the least, political significance. Subsequently, the admirers of Lord Harris who have received favours at his hands sent a notice convening a meeting of the citizens of Bombay in the Hall of the Municipal Corporation. But they reckoned without their host. Twenty-five members of the Corporation headed by that patriotic and public-spirited citizen of Bombay, Mr. D. E.

Wacha, sent in a protest to the Municipal Commissioner, Mr. Acworth, that the Hall should not be given for such a purpose. The gathering storm was avoided and the meeting which was to have been held in the Municipal Hall is proposed to be held in the rooms of the local Chamber of Commerce in a semi-public fashion. Nor is this all. On the 14th instant, there was to have been a motion in the Bombay University Senate to alter the date of the Convocation so that Lord Harris might deliver another Convocation address. But there too the originators of the idea got scent that they would be opposed, and consequently when the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Bhandarkar called upon the Principal Hathornthwaite, M. A., to move the proposition standing in his name, that gentleman stood up and said :—"Mr. Vice-Chancellor and gentlemen of the Senate, I decline to move the proposition which stands in my name." Thus ended another attempt to canonise Lord Harris. Yet the *Times of India* seeks consolation in the discovery that the Vice-Chancellor has the authority to direct the convocation to be held on any day he may select. But we very much doubt whether Dr. Bhandarkar will go against the most emphatic expression of the public will in the matter. That Lord Harris is an autocrat of the first water may be gathered from another recent instance. It will be remembered that the Poona Sarvajanic Sabha addressed a memorial to the Bombay Government on the riots question. It appears that in connection with this memorial, Lord Harris' Government has, without any justification whatever, asked the Sabha to furnish it with the details of the Sabha's meeting at which the memorial was adopted. This conduct on the part of the Bombay Government can, if at all, find a parallel only in the reply of the Madras Government to the Chairman of the Salem public meeting about the Simultaneous Examinations question which we noticed in our last issue. Such are some of the doings of His Lordship of Bombay, and it is no wonder that the people of that Presidency should resort to every constitutional means in their power to thwart the ill-considered and unworthy attempts of a few men who are bent upon perpetuating the rule of one whose administration has been an egregious failure. It is said that the idea of having a statue of Lord Harris has been abandoned, that instead of a public meeting, a meeting of the subscribers only will be held and that a counter-demonstration is being organised on behalf of the people. We hope that the example set by the advanced, independent and unselfish citizens of Bombay will be followed by the people of this Presidency, if occasion calls for it.

11th January 1895.

THE TRIBUNE.

(*ENGLISH.*)

I

Indications have not been wanting that the proposal of having a memorial in honour of Lord Harris will meet with a doubtful reception in the Bombay Presidency, and we have the first open sign of opposition in the protest addressed by a number of Municipal Councillors of Bombay to the Municipal Commissioner against giving the use of the Town Hall for a preliminary meeting of Lord Harris's admirers. These gentlemen hold that the Hall is intended ordinarily for the meeting of the Municipal Corporation, and when it is wanted for any other purpose the proposal should be brought in due form before the Corporation and not disposed of by the Municipal Commissioner, who is an official. So far as it goes the question is a constitutional one, but it is useless to deny that behind it is a feeling which is directed against the administration of Lord Harris. For some time there have been conflicting rumours about attempts to raise a Lord Harris memorial fund. The success or otherwise of such a movement will be no measure of Lord Harris's success or failure as Governor of Bombay. History will not write down Lord Lansdowne as a successful Viceroy of India, but he has been most successful as regards a memorial. Lord Harris has been an unsympathetic Governor, and that is one of the ways of getting a memorial. But if he gets a memorial it will be probably accompanied by a mark of public disapprobation, the first sign of which is to be found in the protest of the Bombay Municipal Councillors. In Calcutta the first attempt to vote a farewell address in the Municipality to Lord Lansdowne was defeated, but afterwards the proposal was carried. The prospect of a cordial farewell from Bombay was so remote that Lord Lansdowne thought it wiser to embark in Calcutta than to proceed to Bombay. The shrieking community in Bombay is not strong. People there are moderate, but they combine firmness with moderation. If there is to be a memorial to Lord Harris the public will expect the Bombay Municipality to vote him a farewell address. Of this we entertain grave doubts. A welcome address may be a mere formality, but a parting address is something more. It sets the seal of approbation upon an administration. If

every Governor or Viceroy is to receive a welcome and a farewell address as a matter of course by virtue of the office which he holds for a definite period and vacates in due course, what possible distinction can be made between a governor whose administration is a success and another whose administration is a failure? The Bombay Municipality represents the citizens of Bombay, and when it does not approve Lord Harris's administration it can withhold its mark of approbation by declining to vote a farewell address to the outgoing Governor of Bombay.

19th January 1895.

II

A List of the subscriptions for a memorial to Lord Harris has been published, and as was anticipated the largest share of the funds comes from Native States. The Maharaja of Bhownugger heads the list with a sum of Rs. 7,000, the Raja of Kolahpur follows with Rs. 4,000, and minor Chiefs contribute according to their means. This pernicious example begins from the time of Lord Lansdowne. We did not hear before of Indian princes being required to subscribe publicly to memorials of Viceroys and Governors. If the practice were to be extended no Governor or Lieutenant-Governor need despair of getting a handsome memorial. Sir James Lyall retired from the Lieutenant-Governorship of the Punjab without a statue or a great memorial. Men in his position used to have conscientious scruples against a memorial raised with subscriptions from Native States. Otherwise, the Punjab has a large number of Native Princes to whom a wink would be as good as a word. No Native State in the Bombay Presidency owes anything in particular to Lord Harris, but since the officials are pleased with him, because he has identified himself with them, the officials have made up their minds to give him a memorial. The Native States are entirely in the hands of officials, and nothing can be easier than to get them to contribute handsomely to such memorials. But the scandal threatens to become very grave and to call for the interference of higher authority. Native States should on no account be permitted to subscribe to a memorial to a Governor or a Viceroy, because it is a distinct approval of a political nature which Native States should never express. Lord Harris has some friends as a cricketer and sportsman, and the Governor is being confounded with the cricketer in order to help the collection of funds. There will be no difficulty about the memorial with Native Princes to swell the fund. But the entire movement will turn upon the farewell address of the Bombay Municipality. Let us see how far his friends succeed in that direction.

23rd January 1895.

THE VIDYAVILAS.

(MARATHI.)

I

A meeting of some of the leading inhabitants of Bombay was held under the presidentship of Mr. Acworth, the Municipal Commissioner on the 15th inst. at which it was resolved to convene a meeting of the friends and admirers of Lord Harris on the 29th inst. in the Town Hall, and to appoint a managing Committee to make the necessary arrangements for the purpose. It seems that this meeting will collect subscriptions for a memorial of Lord Harris. At present subscriptions to the extent of Rs. 25,023 have been registered. The following figure prominently among the subscribers :—

The Maharaja of Bhawnagar	Rs. 7,000
Do. Kolhapur	„ 4,000
Do. Akalkote	„ 1,000
Do. Chhotaudepur	„ 1,000
Do. Dharampur	„ 1,000
The Nawab of Janjira	„ 1,000
The Rajasahab, Santrampur	„ 750
Shrimant Bapu Saheb Kagalkar	„ 500
Do. Bhorkar Sachiva	„ 500
Do. Sanglikar	„ 500

And thus the subscription falls low to the sum of Rs. 2. These are all published in the Bombay dailies.

This shows that the hitherto unsettled memorial scheme has considerably developed. But a question arises in this regard whether the present memorial scheme is voluntarily proposed as was in the case of Lord Ripon and other similar personages or whether it is brought about by some selfseeking interested men. The memorial meetings on previous occasions were composed of true friends and representatives of the Natives. Lord Harris has not done a single act of public welfare : on the contrary the public peace has been disturbed in his *regime*. The Hindu and Mahomedan riots of the Presidency, and their result are the best memorial of the Harris administration and we therefore think that any other memorial is unnecessary. The subscriptions registered should be utilized towards some better purpose than erecting a stone-statue, so that it may be the best memorial of the present governor."

18th January 1895.

II

"As previously proposed a meeting was held in the Town Hall on Tuesday, 29th January, for a memorial of Lord Harris but the audience consisted mostly of brokers, clerks &c. None of the leading citizens were present. It is, therefore, plain enough that the meeting cannot be called a public meeting and that the resolution no way binds the public. But it is a matter of surprise that this nominal meeting has been described at great length by the English dailies. It will therefore cause misapprehension among those who do not read vernacular papers or those who know English only. It is evident that the leading people of this presidency do not like in any way to congratulate Lord Harris or to raise a memorial. In the memorial fund Rs. 29,000 have been subscribed by the native Rajas and chiefs. Among these the chiefs of Guzerath and Rajaputana have subscribed a larger portion. We think that they have been encouraged to do so by the late visit of His Excellency in those Districts.

31st January 1895.

DHARWAR VRITTA.

(MARAṬHĪ.)

I

"What a fiasco"! until now a good many governors came to preside over the destinies of the people of the Bombay Presidency, but it fell to the lot of none to see his career so adversely criticised as that of Lord Harris. The protest of independent and elected representatives in the Corporation against the use of the Municipal Hall for the holding of a preliminary meeting in connection with the memorial as well as the unwillingness of the Senate in general to fix the day of the Convocation a week earlier than that prescribed by the rules show the popularity of the regime of H. E. the Governor. It seems probable that at the time of his departure people might sit at home with closed doors as was done in Poona at the time of the last Mokorum. All this is the result of want of statesmanship added to an implicit confidence in the subordinate Executive officers. It is admitted His Lordship is a very good cricketer, but he has miserably failed in the act of government. This would have been avoided, had he about him good councillors. If he had good and wise councillors, the memorial of the *Sarvajanik Sabha* would not have been treated so lightly as it has been, the memorial of

the people of *Wai* would not have been rejected, and no appeal would have been lodged in the Poona Trials. In short it was unfortunate both for him and the people that to the last wise counsels did not prevail in his council. His Lordship's career will be a lesson to future governors. If they walk in his footsteps, they will see how adversely his career has been criticised. Day by day people have begun to understand their rights. Lord Harris' friends and admirers are trying very hard to raise subscriptions for his memorial, his proteges as well as those that have no independent spirit may contribute to his memorial fund.

24th January 1895.

KALPATARU.

(MABA THIL.)

I

Efforts are being made to raise funds for the perpetuation of the memory of H. E. Lord Harris. All Maharajas are pouring their quota and when a sufficiently large figure has been raised it is proposed to convene a meeting of friends and admirers in Bombay to consider what steps should be taken to give a final form to the memorial. Private efforts were being made to launch this scheme. Anglo-Indian admirers there may be many and they may pay for this object; but the people in general will abstain themselves from this memorial. His Lordship's career as far as Hindus are concerned has instead of proving a boon and a blessing proved to be one of persecution. Some of the Mahomedans, who seem to have been favoured with his patronage, may come forward and contribute their mite. Had Mr. Lee-Warner been here, he would have raised a pretty large sum for the memorial, but unfortunately he has been transferred to the Mysore Durbar.

18th November 1894.

II

A preliminary meeting about Lord Harris' memorial was held in Bombay under the presidency of Mr. Acworth. It is a question if Lord Harris' career deserves to be perpetuated. His flatterers are the cause of his career being so adversely criticised. If those who do not deserve to be praised are praised by the interested and slavish people, then the others who represent the true side of the case

have to open their mouths and place the facts before the people. I Lord Harris would have been allowed to go as quietly as he came to Bombay, his injudicious and unpopular career would even have been forgotten ; but his so-called friends are compelling him to say—*save me from my friends.*

20th January 1895.

NYAYASINDHU.

(MARATHI.)

I

We hear that the friends of Lord Harris, are making strenuous efforts to raise a memorial of His Excellency. His Excellency's followers have amassed up to now about 25,000 Rs. for the Memorial. Of these Rs. 20,000 have been given by the Native Rajas and Chiefs of Bhawnaggar Kolhapur, Kojal, Bhor, Sangli, Janjera and Akalkot &c., and the rest 500 have been subscribed by some Parsees, Hindus, Musalmans, Europeans, Jews and others. This amount of subscriptions has been collected by the followers of His Excellency simply by throwing dust in the eyes of the people. All these subscriptions have been paid on the understanding that Lord Harris has been one of the Rulers of this Presidency. Messrs. Acworth, Beaufort and Wadia have been doing great efforts to give a public character to this memorial. A memorial means an object to perpetuate the name of an individual in whose honor it is to be raised. Can these men show what benefits Lord Harris has conferred on the poor ryots of this Presidency during his five years administration to deserve a memorial. A public memorial should be for some better qualities in which all the people should join voluntarily. It is valued not by the money collected for it but by the popularity it has gained. It is therefore quite wrong for these friends of His Excellency to give their efforts a form of public character. We are therefore of opinion that the memorial movement is not a public one. Those on whom His Excellency has conferred big titles or who have been honoured by him may out of gratitude preserve His Excellency's portrait in their places of worship at home and may worship it daily, but should not indulge themselves in such an inexcusable folly. If they do so we think that it will blemish the reputation of His Excellency. His Excellency may desire to increase his reputation but in doing so he should look to what he has done for the good of the people.

28th January 1895.

THE CHIKITSKA.

(MARATHI.)

TO HAVE A MEMORIAL IS THE PROPER THING.

Since last week about all the native papers have been writing against the stir that is being made in Bombay to have a memorial for Lord Harris. The five year's administration of Lord Harris will be remembered for its oppressive character. His Excellency has not done a single thing calculated to give satisfaction to the people. The effect of each of his deeds will be sadly felt for several years after Lord Harris has quitted this Presidency. His actions are not like those of other partial and subordinate-led officers, devoid of any sense of justice for so soon as they leave the country, their actions are forgotten. The sweeping deprivation of the rights of the Khots in the Devegad Taluka, land revenue survey for the third time in the Pen Taluka in spite of Her Gracious Majesty's promise, the riots between the Hindus and Mahomedans and the justice awarded in respect thereof, the generosity of Government in the matter of election for the Legislative Council and the thoughts expressed at Ahmadnagar, Sholapur and Ahmadabad are sufficient memorials indeed! Why need then this sportive Governor always confiding in his partial advisers have a separate memorial? Why should respectable members of the native community commit the sin of placing him, through some rash act or other, on an equal footing with Ripon or Reay and thus turn out ungrateful? This is what most of us are inclined to think. Now as to the form that the 25000 rupees collected should take we might suggest that a sum might be reserved from the interest of which the expenses of the punitive police force, imposed through the grace of His Excellency on the Yeola people, can be defrayed. The seed of discord being once sown during His Lordship's *regime*, we might have several more occasions for the imposition of punitive forces and the interest of the memorial money would be adequately utilized on successive occasions as has been suggested. We might also suggest an alternative, namely, that the whole amount collected might be employed in recovering the abnormally enhanced land revenue of Pen and other talukas.

30th January 1895.

THE RAGHAV BHUSHAN.

(MARATHI)

THE MEMORIAL TO H. E. LORD HARRIS.

A great fuss is being made of the memorial in honour of His Excellency and reasons are being advanced as to why His Lordship is thought undeserving to get one. This circumstance leads us to say a few words as to the objects of having memorials. It was customary to raise memorials to some extraordinary personage who by deeds of benevolence, valour or public reform had entitled himself to public respect. People naturally liked to have before their minds the life and actions of such personages as served as incentives for succeeding generations. Things are now altered, and memorials not the less so. Memorials being raised oftener now and without any appreciable reason fail to effect the object which they are designed to accomplish. However bad a man might be he must be endowed with some good quality or other. But to praise a person for such a solitary quality and ignore his multitudinous failings appears to be an innovation of recent date. Even admitting Lord Harris possesses all the sociability, sporting acumen, and sweetness of temper attributed to him, what is there in them that entitled his Lordship to have a memorial erected to him? We must take into consideration how far persons like Lord Harris have employed their skill and knowledge for the accomplishment of the functions they were deputed to discharge. Subordinate considerations such as the encouragement afforded to physical education are not in themselves sufficient qualifications for commemorating the administration of a Governor. Any disinterested person may be convinced of the justice of this remark. If the friends of Lord Harris had not attempted to hold a memorial meeting, no occasion, we think, would have occurred to expose His Lordship to the ridicule and compassion of the people at large.

4th February 1895.

THE KAISER-I-HIND.

(ANGLO-VERNACULAR)

AN OPEN LETTER

To

H. E. LORD HARRIS,

GOVERNOR OF BOMBAY.

YOUR LORDSHIP,

Ere the next issue of this journal sees the light of day, your Lordship will have left these shores amidst the usual official demonstrations and salvos of artillery, which are, of course, the inevitable accompaniments of departing representatives of Her Majesty the Queen Empress, and amidst many a chorus of salutes from your score of friends and admirers, who, during the past few weeks, have excelled themselves in holding before the world of Bombay, your many social and private virtues and giving expression to their sense of undying gratitude for many a favour shewn, by enshrining your memory in a memorial, which, in stateliness, shall surpass the majesty and grandeur of the indigenous Ghauts and endure in permanence the kingly pyramids of Egypt. Such being the circumstances attending your departure next Saturday, we deem it fair, in justice not only to your Lordship, but to that vast majority of the discerning public, whose thoughts, sentiments, and feelings we faintly, but faithfully, endeavour to echo from week to week in these columns, to pronounce in your presence, fearlessly and honestly, the general verdict formed on your Lordship's administration. We shall set down naught in malice, for malicious representation of the conduct and deeds of public men, exalted or unexalted, is abhorrent to our feelings. We leave it to that press, Anglo-Indian and Vernacular which scruples not, from motives best known to it, to indulge in such deliberate misrepresentations. Invariably swayed as we have been in the conduct of this journal by lofty ideas, which should guide the honest publicist, we shall say naught but which we consider to be the very truth of matters. And we trust your Lordship will accept our criticism, whether you like it or dislike it, in the *spirit* in which it is offered.

Attached to no party, but interested only for the truth and candour of History, we regret to have to say it then, that, viewed as a whole, the

public considers your administration to be devoid of any mark of ability. let alone statesmanship. Administrators no doubt are after all human. Humanly judging, it would be wrong to expect perfection from them. But at any rate, we have a right to judge of them according to ordinary standards of government, making all necessary allowances for imperfections. As in other mundane matters, so in the art of government, administrations are judged according to their results. "Judge me by my deeds," so said the Marquis of Ripon in reply to the address of our citizens, when landing for the first time on the shores of India. And judged he was accordingly. The genuine and spontaneous demonstrations with which he was greeted, when laying down his high office, in all parts of the country, bore conclusive testimony to his Viceregal deeds. An administrator of deep and abiding sympathy for the people, of sterling rectitude and strictest impartiality, of practical knowledge and immense experience, it was natural he should endear himself to all classes and communities. Tolerance of public opinion was his distinguishing trait. Wide publicity in affairs of State was his constant aim, feeling convinced that the greater the publicity, the deeper the confidence of the people in their rulers. And the more that public criticism, good, bad and indifferent, which was brought to bear on the pressing problems of the day, the better the Government was enabled to understand the depth and breadth of popular thoughts and feelings.

Your Lordship will excuse us, if we say, that intolerance of criticism has been the besetting sin of your administration. It is this rock on which you have allowed yourself, consciously or unconsciously, it is not for us to say, to be completely wrecked. Respect of public opinion has never been your distinguishing trait as an administrator. You came imbued from England with strong notions of English ascendancy—ascendancy as understood in its worst and not its best aspects—ascendancy which meant, according to Mr. Lee-Warner, your guide, philosopher and friend, the repression of the people of this country in all their legitimate aspirations to rise higher in the scale of nations. That spirit of ascendancy, a born Conservative as you were and nurtured in its best and worst traditions, found unlimited vent in a variety of directions. One principal and all-compelling reason of importing Viceroys and Governors from the free atmosphere of England is, that they would rise superior to the pride, passion and prejudice of the bureaucracy, by which they are inevitably surrounded. That, in fact, they would stand as a sort of terrestrial Providence between the dumb-driven people on the one side and the haughty and selfish guild of the governing caste on the other, that they would hold the scales of justice evenly and maintain un-

swervingly those great and broad principles of polity, on which the farsighted statesmen of half a century and over deliberately laid down for the government of our people. It is sad to have to state that you have failed to realise that ideal of a Governor. On the contrary, you have done almost everything to stimulate that fatal spririt of ascendancy—the same which is the cry of your party and which found such unpleasant echo in Parliament, during the passage of the Amended Councils' Act, from Lord Salisbury. In our opinion, it has been at the root of all your larger administrative acts. It is this spirit, which has hopelessly prevented you from respecting public opinion. No doubt, in a way, you endeavoured to listen to it. You gathered round you a few men, whom you were advised you might consult at times. We should not be so unjust to you as to say that the men, whom you consulted, were all who were on the side of officials and who were anxious or ambitious to promote their personal interest., at the sacrifice of those of their countrymen. One or two were certainly men who were representatives of the people—representatives in whom the people reposed their confidence. But the majority were not of that character and type. It must be said, and said with the greatest reluctance and sorrow, that the gentlemen, whom you were wont more or less to consult, were those whom the people refused to consider as their leaders or representatives in any sense of the term.

Again, so completely did your Lordship allow yourself to be swayed by the bureaucracy surrounding you, that you were carried away by their advice and pressure. You implicitly believed in the Anglo-Indian cant that the Civil Service, whatever its merits, was a prodigy of service, cyclopædic in its knowledge, Seneca like in its wisdom, and infallible in its judgment like the Pope at the Vatican. You failed to take it at its proper worth. You relied entirely on it. You cared not to extend your mental horizon, by endeavouring to understand and comprehend the people, for whom you, from the very first, conceived a kind of contempt not unnatural to one, nurtured, we repeat, in the traditions of the chaotic Conservative. Your Lordship, like many other administrators belonging to the heaven-born service entirely forgot that

"All knowledge is not couched in Moses' law
The Pentateuch or what the Prophets wrote."

In India, and in the world of Anglo-India, it is notorious that the knowledge and experience of the Civil Service are the whole knowledge necessary in the art of governing this great country. that what Civilians

of the type of a Temple, a Strachey, a Chesney or an Elliott write, is virtually the Pentateuch of the Indian Administration, and that the writers are really the Anglo-Indian Prophets, whose wise sayings and wiser saws should be held as gospel. It entirely escaped your Lordship that

“The Gentiles also know, and write and teach
To admiration, led by Nature’s light.”

No. That was both your misfortune and the misfortune of the people, over whom you ruled, during the last five years. Had you been well advised, you might have been told.

And with the Gentiles much thou must converse,
Ruling them by persuasion, as thou meanest;
Ithotuw their learning, how wilt thou with them,
Or they with thee, hold conversation meet?
How wilt thou reason with them, how refute
Their idolisms, traditions, paradoxes?”

But you almost wholly ignored the Gentiles, that is to say, the people—as contradistinguished from the tribe of White Brahmans or the governing caste.

Thus, from woeful lack of deep and abiding sympathy for the people contemptuous disregard of public opinion, and intolerance of healthy popular criticism, your Lordship failed to give any reasonable satisfaction. Your administrative failure in every important public measure can be easily traced to these three sources. We purposely refrain from alluding to all such measures in details, for the simple reason, that we are all painfully familiar with them. Your governorship can hardly be said to be marked by any great administrative act, which could be fairly pointed out with pride and satisfaction and which could be reasonably held to have led to the permanent welfare of our people. For instance, let us only look at your legislation. The very first piece was that having reference to Municipal servants. Here you obstinately refused to listen to the opposition of nonofficial members who criticised some of the repressive and despotic sections in it—sections harsh and altogether uncalled for. You are well aware what healthy criticism had the State Secretary for the time being to make in respect thereto. No doubt, he was bound to allow the Act, without vetoing it, in pursuance of that absurdly mistaken policy of not bringing down the so-called “prestige” of administrations. Then, take your Vaccination Act. Have you not been obliged, very late in the day, to admit by your executive orders and resolutions, and by some of your own recent utterances,—to admit the forecast, which some

of the nonofficial members had given, at the time of the passing of that measure? Of course, you ignored their warning then, but the Nemesis of Justice has verified the nonofficial Cassandras. Take again your Mowra Bill—a bill, which met with such universal opposition, even from your own friendly party press, a bill which even now has offered no justification for its passing, though we are aware of the impotent attempts made by the veracious Abkari department to invest it with a halo of glory and as an illustration of its own unverified statements touching crime and illicit distillation. Shall we proceed, and say anything about the distribution of seats in connexion with the Councils' Act? It is all well to say your hands were not free and that you simply obeyed Viceregal orders. But is it or is it not a fact, that your administration was the party to *suggest* that no more than eight elective seats should be given to non official members. And what are we to say, again, to the principle on which the seats eventually came to be distributed? Was it not the case that here also, there was a consensus of public opinion condemning it? There was neither justice nor impartiality in leaving out in the cold so important a division as the Central and favouring a commercial body with double representation. What, again, shall we say to the way in which interpellations were answered and the manner in which non-official members were prevented from saying their say? Say what you will, there is not the least doubt, that in your capacity as President of the Council you exercised your authority with no little arbitrariness, by straining the rules. But it is of no use going over again the same ground, which we have treaded in these columns for many weeks past. Some of your press panegyrists, however, have endeavoured to swell small and large measures of your administration. Allow us, please, to remind your Lordship, that if revenue grows, if public works are stimulated, if hospitals and dispensaries grow in numbers, if the number of Municipal institutions shows a slight increase, if mortality in a solitary year shows decrease—if all these and other circumstances occur, it is absurd to say that they are ascribable to one and one cause alone, namely, a wise and judicious administration. Is it impossible to conceive the growth of revenue, accompanied by arbitrary measures? Take for instance land revenue. Are we to attribute its growth to the wisdom of Government or rather to the unwise and tyrannous survey settlements, which are the theme of bitter complaints and appeals to important parts of the Presidency? Then, are we to ascribe the ordinary growth in other sources of revenue to wisdom alone or to a natural course of things? It is indeed astounding to be told that they all owe their origin, to a large extent, to the wisdom of the administration. We presume that when the drink traffic goes up by leaps and bounds in the United Kingdom, the Chancellor of the Exchequer ascribes it to his

statesmanship! Is it so? Or when stamps and registration show an increase, are we to presume that it has nothing to do with trade and litigation, but with the wisdom of the governing authorities? We are prepared to give every credit to the growth of revenue, where it distinctly owes its origin to any statesmanlike measure, specially put into motion. We shall be the last to deny your Lordship the credit you may richly deserve, if you could kindly condescend to inform us in some of the last utterances you may soon deliver in two or three public or semi-public places, that the revenue has increased during your administration owing to certain special reasons, which are entirely ascribable to the statesmanship of your government. Similarly, with the policy of extension of railways and public works. How much may be owing to the ordinary course of things and how much to any extra stimulus specifically due to the geniuses who had the charge of the administration. We repeat, your Lordship, that we have not the least desire to belittle any act of your Government or to deny it the credit, where credit is due to your spontaneous action or stimulus. But it is impossible that any publicist, fairly conversant with the ways of administration, can give credit for what comes in the ordinary routine way.

Again in the matter of local taxation, your panegyrists have not been slow to bring forth a reason, which we have not heard for the first time, that you have uniformly endeavoured to protect the tax-payer as against the rate-payer. No doubt, that is true. But may we fairly inquire whether your Lordship has equally endeavoured to see that the local rate-payer is not squeezed in order to supply the needs of the provincial or the imperial tax-payer? In matters of this kind your Lordship will no doubt, be the first to agree with us, that if the tax-payer is to be protected, the rate-payer equally needs protection. Can it be honestly averred that in the matter of the enhanced charges of the city police your government at all considered the interests of the rate-payers! Or is it true that your government, in spite of facts and figures, as shewn in various ways, endeavoured, by the force of their executive power, to make an unjustifiable raid on the Municipal coffers?

Then, as to decreased mortality. Are we to assume, as your Lordship's panegyrists observe, that it is due to your benign care and solicitude for sanitation? Is this a fact or a fiction? Even admitting it to be a fact, can it be said that it is a wise administration, which reduces mortality? Suppose if mortality increases to-morrow, shall we be entitled to ascribe it to the converse, namely, want of the same statesmanship? Or shall we say that it is owing to many a physical and social condition that mortality owes its rise or fall, however administrations, in their

wisdom, may try to check it. On the assumption and logic of your panegyrist, whenever there is no cholera or typhoid fever in Bombay, we must take the flattering unction to our soul, that it is entirely owing to the wisdom of our rulers !

But we shall not extend this letter to a portentous length. We have, we trust, made it sufficiently clear to your Lordship that, say what they will, your friends and admirers have hardly made out a case to warrant the absurd step of perpetuating your memory. They have failed to point out any single important measure of permanent utility and benefit, for which the people might gratefully accord you a substantial acknowledgment, on the eve of your laying down your high office. If every administrator, be he good, bad or indifferent, is thus to be apotheosised for performing the most ordinary functions—or at any rate functions which are *hardly above* the run of ordinary duties—if such is to be the condition at present and in future, you will no doubt agree with us, that we should not exercise any discrimination. That an Elphinstone or a Munro should be put on a par with a Wodehouse or a Harris. Your Lordship may be a well meaning personage. We have no reason to dispute the statement. You may also be extremely [social and courteous. We do not deny those virtues. But we, as publicists, are not to be solely guided, in our estimate of your capacity as ruler by such virtues alone. They are, after all, mere adjuncts. As we stated at the commencement, an administrator must be judged by his deeds. When we come to judge you from that stand-point, we cannot refrain from expressing our deepest sorrow, that your Lordship has displayed none of those administrative virtues, which contribute to popular esteem and regard. On the other hand, apart from negative virtues, your Lordship's rule is not devoid of glaring administrative vices of a most mischievous character—vices, which found full vent in connexion with the incidents of the several riots that took place in different parts of the Presidency during the last fifteen months. But on the eve of your departure, we deem it our duty to throw a veil over your many ill-advised and unstatesmanlike utterances. All that we shall say here is this. That your Lordship has proved every inch what a Governor should not be. Your extreme lack of sympathy with the people, your disregard of genuine native public opinion, your intolerance of outside criticism, and your implicit reliance on the bureaucracy which surrounded you, have been the principal causes of your failure. You may have meant well. We can only judge you by your results. And as the results are not only disappointing, but in some matters of moment most mischievous, we hope you will pardon us if, for the last time, we are constrained to characterise your administration as an admini-

administration of failure. May that Providence, who watches over the destinies of India, guide you to wisdom in your retirement, and may you still be spared in your own country to lead a career of usefulness, by profiting by the sad and bitter experience acquired in this country during the tenure of that exalted office which you are now to lay down, amidst little or no regret of the population at large over whom you ruled during the last five years.

10th February 1895.

NATIVE OPINION.

GOOD-BYE TO H. E. LORD HARRIS.

We are sincerely glad that for once we have an occasion to say a good word for Lord Harris. We have often acknowledged that his Lordship is personally an amiable man, and if any credit was due to mere good wishes and generous sentiments, his Lordship deserved to be popular. It was his misfortune however to be appointed to a post for which he was both intellectually and morally unfit. He possessed neither the ability nor the strong will that was required in the Governor of a Presidency ; and consequently during his quinquennial regime he proved nothing but the mouth-piece and an ornamental figure-head of a notoriously selfish and narrow-minded bureaucracy. Inexperienced and pliable, instead of leading others, he was led by his subordinates ; and unsuspecting as he was, he never found out the real source of his unpopularity. We know of occasions when he tried to disarm opposition by all the force of kind promises and personal courtesy ; but he failed till the last moment to realize that mere courtesy and promises cannot take away the effect of some of the greatest administrative blunders. He was a thorough gentleman but a bad Governor, and though probably he always meant well, his numerous administrative faults of commission and omission have earned for him a lasting name as one of the worst Governors of Bombay. He undertook a task beyond his powers and he failed ; and we are sorry for the result, both for his sake and for that of the people. This is the last occasion that we write while Lord Harris is in India, and we have therefore taken this opportunity to give

succinctly our estimate of his character. Lord Harris has never been a friend of the Native Press, and there is no reason why the Native Press should praise him. Almost since the beginning of his official life he has carried on a regular war with the Native Press of this Presidency, and in his latest administrative acts, the reply to the Sarvajanic Sabha, he has taken full revenge upon his unfriendly critics by roundly charging them with fanning the riots. His Lordship's recent utterances, however, show that he is anxious to secure the good wishes of all parties before he goes home, and we on our part assure him that although we had many occasions to give hard hits while criticizing his measures, we bear him no ill-will personally. He promises to do personal active work for India even after leaving these shores, and although we do not expect much from him by way of good, we thank him for the promises and only hope that, if he does not do good, he will not at least exert his influence for evil, as some of his predecessors are doing. In bidding farewell we say to his Lordship on behalf of the Native Press : We lived in mutual hostilities for five years, but let us part as friends ; and let us part for ever, if your Lordship after leaving India cannot do any good to her.

14th February 1895.

LAY OF A LORDLY CRICKETER.

(With apologies to Mr. W. Gilbert.)

An M. C. C. young man
A Varsity young man
First rate all rounder
Hit to the boundary
Fond of his "see" young man.

A county crack young man
In business slack young man
A Bombay Gymkhanery
Ganeshkhind and Wanowry
Wanting in tact young man.

A West-Indies young man
From over the seas young man
Extremely Lee-Warnery
And very very or'nary
Taking his esse young man.

A Government House young man
A truffles and grouse young man
A political nonentity
Negligable quantity
But easy to rouse young man.

The time at the disposal of the compiler being very limited he regrets his inability to include here the articles from the following Gujarati and Marathi papers in the Presidency town and in the Mofussil as also those that have appeared in the several newspapers whilst these sheets were passing through the press. These articles however will be published by way of supplement to this compilation. For the same reason the compiler regrets that he could not give English translation of the Gujarati articles that appear at the end of this compilation : The *Satya Mitra* and *Moombai Vaibhav* (Bombay), *Kesari* and *Poona Vaibhav* (Poona), *Sudhakar* (Pen, Colaba District), *Maharashtra Mitra*, *Vritthi 'Sara* and *Bodh Sudhakar* (Satara), *Khandesh Vaibhav* (Dhulia), and *Suryodaya* (Tanna), *Bakul* (Ratnagiri) &c.

BOMBAY SAMACHAR.

૧

નામદાર લાર્ડ હેરીસના અમલમાં થયલાં બીજાં નાપસંદ
કામો ઉપર અખાડા કરી જઈ તેના તરફથી થયલાં
એક ઓછી અગતનાં સારાં કામ માટે તેને જાહેર
માન આપવાની હિલચાલ કરનારા અહસ્થોએ
પ્રજના લાલને નુકસાન કરવા જેવું
પકડેલું ધોરણ.



ક્રીકેટની તથા બીજી અંગબળની કસરતોને ઉત્તેજન આપવા માટે
નામદાર ગવરનર લાર્ડ હેરીસને જાહેર માન આપવાની જે હિલચાલ
પ્રજના આગેવાનોમાં ખપતા કેટલાક દેશી અહસ્થોએ ઉભી નૂકરી છે તેને
નફી ધોરણ ઉપર મેલવા માટે ગઈ પરમ દીને તેઓએ પોતાની સભા
ખોલાવી હતી, અને તેમાં હાજર થયલા ત્રણ અહસ્થોએ જોકે હિલચાલની
વીરૂધ પોતાનાં મત આપ્યાં હતાં તોપણ બાકીના સાહેબો પોતાની મરજીના
ઠરાવો પસાર કરી ઉઠ્યા છે. તે કામ બળવી જવા સામે અમલક જેવું
અલબત્તે કાંઈ ન હતું. પ્રજના આગેવાનમાં ખપતા કે બીજા અહસ્થો
અમુક કામ પાર ઉતારવા માટે સારી સંખ્યામાં એકમત થયા હોય, તો
પ્રજની ઈછા કે લાભની વીરૂધ જઈને પણ ગમે એવા ઠરાવો તેઓ પસાર
કરી ઉઠે તેમાં નહીં બતવા જેવું કાંઈ નથી; પણ તેમનું કામ દુરદેશી
બરેલું અથવા માનને હાયક થયું છે કે કેમ તે બીજોજ સવાલ છે, અને
તે વીરૂધ પ્રજનો અભીપ્રાય જોયા ઉપરથીજ વીચાર કરવાને બની આવે
છે. આટલું તો કમુલ રાખવામાં આવશે કે લખો અથવા કરોડો માણસો
ઉપર હકુમત ભોગવનારા એક હાકમને પ્રજનાં નામથી કે મોટાં રૂપમાં
માન આપવાનું કામ, થોડી જોખમદારીથી બરેલું નથી. તે કરનારાઓ-

એ પોતાને અથવા હાકમને માત્ર સાફ લગાડવાનો, અથવા પોતાના કાઈ મિત્ર અથવા મિત્રોનું મોહોડું રાખી કામ લેવાનો, અથવા પોતાના તરફ ખતાવવામાં આવેલી મેહેરબાની કે મોહોબતનો પાડ વાળવાનો વીચાર તો કરવો નથીજ જોઈતો. વીચાર જે કરવાનો છે તે, અમુક હાકમને પ્રજાને નામે માન આપવામાં વાજબી અથવા પ્રજાના ભવીષના લાભ સાચવવા જેવું થાય છે કે કેમ તેને લગતો છે; અને તે ધોરણે તપાસતાં લારડ હેરીસને જાહેર માન આપવાની કરવામાં આવેલી હીલચાલ વાજબી ગણાશે અથવા પ્રજાના ભવીષના લાભ સાચવવા જેવી થઈ પડશે એમ સમજવું મુશ્કેલ પડે છે. કીક્ટની તથા બીજી રમતગમતોને નામદાર લારડ હેરીસે ઠીક ઉત્તેજન આપ્યું છે એ વાત આપણે કબુલ કરીશું; પણ તેજ વેલા યાદ રાખવાનું એ છે કે તે કામ તે નામદારની કારકીરદીમાં થયેલાં ધણાં ધણાં કામોમાંનું માત્ર એક અને ઓછી અગત્યનું છે, અને તે એક કામ જ્યારે પસંદ કરવા જેવું નીવડ્યું છે ત્યારે બાકીનાં ધણાં અને મોટી અગત્ય ધરાવનારાં કામોથી પ્રજા થોડી નીરાશ તથા દુઃખી બની નથી. તેવાં ધણાં કામો સામે નાપસંદગીનો અભીપ્રાય જાહેર કર્યા પછી અથવા તેની સાથે સાથે તે એક કામને વખાણવામાં આવતું હોત, તો તેમ કરનારાં એને પોતાની દરજ્જા બરાબર બજાવના સમજવામાં આવત. પણ ધણાં કામો ઉપર વીચાર કરવા અથવા અભીપ્રાય દરશાવવાના અખાડા કરી જઈ બાકીનાં એક ઉત્તરતી અગત્યનાં કામને હદ બાહરે વળત આપવામાં આવે, ત્યારે તે કામ વાજબી ધોરણ ઉપર કે પ્રજાના લાભમાં થતું કેવી રીતે કહેવાશે? ભવીષના હાકમોને તે ઉપરથી ગોચા એવીજ સમજ પાડવા જેવું થવું જોઈએ કે, બીજી દરેક રીતે પ્રજાને તેઓ નુકસાન કરશે તોપણ, તેના લાભનું એકાદ નાનું કામ તેઓ કરશે અથવા પ્રજાના આગેવાનો કેહેવાતા થોડાકને રાજ કરી નાખશે તો પ્રજાનાં નામનું માન બાકી જવું તેમને મુશ્કેલ પડવાનું નથી. અને તેવીજ સમજ પ્રજાના થોડા અથવા ધણા આગેવાનોએ ઉત્પન્ન થવા દીધી, તો ભવીષના હાકમો ઉપર પ્રજા તરફનો અંકુશ રહેવા પામેજ નહી. નબળા અથવા પ્રજાને નુકસાન કરનારા હાકમને પ્રજાને નામનું માન આપવામાં સમાયલા તે પ્રકારના જોખમ વીધે આ પેહેલી વારજ અમે બોલતા નથી. માજી ગવર્નર લારડ રે, જે હાકમ તરીકેના જુદા જુદા ગુણોની બાબતોમાં નામદાર લારડ હેરીસ કરતાં ઘણું દરજ્જાએ અહોરતો હતો, તેની કારકીરદીની આખેરીએ પણ તેજ પ્રકારનો ચેતવણીનો અવાજ અમે એ ઉઠાવ્યો હતો, અને

તે ઉપર બરાબર ધ્યાન આપવામાં આવ્યું ન હતું. અને દલગીરી સાથે અમો જોઈએ છીએ કે તે સમયે જોઓએ અમારી ચેતવણી ઉપર ધ્યાન આપ્યું ન હતું, તેઓજ આ વેળા લારડ હેરીસને જાહેર માન આપવા નીકળ્યા છે. લારડ રેને આપવામાં આવેલાં જાહેર માનથી લારડ હેરીસને આપવામાં આવતું તેવું માન, ઉતરતા પ્રકારનું છે ; પણ પ્રજના લાભ સાચવવાને લગતા નીયમોનો ભંગ બંનેમાં એકસરખી રીતે કરવામાં આવતો અમો સમજીએ છીએ. લારડ હેરીસને માટે હીલચાલ કરવા નીકળેલા ગ્રહસ્થાનાં કામથી બીજો એક અનરથ ઉત્પન્ન થવાનો ભય રહે છે તે વધી ધ્યાનમાંથી ખસેડવો નથી જોઈતો. લારડ હેરીસનાં નાપસંદ કામો ઉપર અખાડા કરી જઇ તેનાં એક સારાં કામ માટે તેને જાહેર માન આપવાની હીલચાલ તેઓએ કર્યાથી, કાં નહીં બીજા કેટલાક સાહેબો આડે રસ્તે ઉતરી પડી તે નામદારને માન અપાવવાની વધુ મોઝા પાયા ઉપર જુદી હીલચાલ ઉભી કરવા નીકળી પડે ?

તા. ૯ મી જાનેવારી ૧૮૮૫.

૨

નામદાર ગવરનરની યાદગારી રાખવા માટે ગૌઠવાણ કરવાના હેતુથી “દાસ્તો અને વખાણનારાઓ”ની ટાઉન હાલમાં બોલાવવા ધારેલી સભા—
દેશી પ્રજના કેટલાક આગેવાનોએ તેમાં લીધેલો જણાવો ભાગ અને તેથી દેશી પ્રજ વચે નાપસંદ ચરચા ચાલવાનો સંભવ.



યુરોપીયન, હીંદુ, મોહમેદન અને પારસી ગ્રહસ્થાની એક સભા ગઈ પરામ દીને ચેમબર આવ કામરસનાં દીવાનખાનામાં મલી હતી અને જેનો વીમતે હેવાલ ગઇ કાલે અમો આપી ગયા છીએ, તેણે આવતી તા. ૨૯ મી અને મંગળવારે ટાઉન હાલમાં મોટી સભા બરી નામદાર

ગવરનર ક્ષારડ હેરીસની યાદગારી રાખવાની ગોઠવણ કરવાનો ઠરાવ કીધો છે. જોકે સભા જાહેર રીતે બોલાવવામાં આવનાર છે તોપણ તે નામદાર ગવરનરના દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓની જ થશે એમ જણાવવામાં આવ્યું છે. કોઈ પણ અહરથના દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ પોતાના ક્ષેત્રોમાં ખુશી કરવાને કારણે સભા ભરે તેમાં પારકાઓને લાગતું વળગતું નથી એ ખરું છે, પણ નામદાર ગવરનરના દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ટાઉન હાલ મધે તે નામે એક જાહેર સભા બોલાવે, અને તેની “ હાકમીને વખત પુરો થવા આવયાથી તે નામદારની યાદગારી હમેશાં રહે એવું યાદગારીનું કામ ” ત્યાં બળવવાનો ઇરાદો જાહેર કરે, ત્યારે તે ખીના પારકાઓએ અને પ્રજાના મોઢા ભાગે વીચાર કરવા માટે જુદું જ રૂપ પકડે છે. પેહેલાં સવાલ એ ઉભો થાય છે કે મુબઈ ઇલાકાની કરોડોથી ગણાતી વસ્તીના એક હાકમને તેની પાંચ વરસની કારકીરદી મછી માન આવવાની તથા તેની “ યાદગારી હમેશાં રહે એવું કામ ” કરવાની જરૂર હોય તો, તે કામ તેના “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓએ ” જ શામાટે હાથ ધરવું જોઈએ? કાં નહીં તેમાં આખી પ્રજાને સામેલ કરવામાં આવતી? અને જ્યારે પ્રજાને સામેલ કરવામાં આવતી નથી ત્યારે તેનું કારણ હોવું જોઈએ. તે કારણ શું છે તે છુપું નથી. નામદાર ગવરનરની પાંચ વરસની સામટી કારકીરદીથી પ્રજા નારાજ થઈ છે; અને તે નારાજ થઈ છે તેટલા માટે તે તે નામદારની યાદગારી રાખવાને ચાહતી નથી એવી ખાતરી થયાથી, તે નામદારના દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓએ પ્રજાથી જુદા પડી યાદગારીને લગતી કીલચાલ કરવાનો ઠરાવ કર્યો છે. પણ “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ” જ નામદાર ગવરનરની યાદગારી રાખવાના ઠરાવ ઉપર જ્યારે આવયા છે, ત્યારે જે ખીજી બાબત તપાસવા માટે આપણી આગળ આવી પડે છે તે એ કે તે યાદગારી તે નામદારના કેવા પ્રકારનાં કામો માટે રાખવા ધારી છે? એમ જણાવવામાં આવશે કે તે નામદારના દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓને તેના ચોકસ ગુણો ધણા પસંદ પડ્યા છે, અને તેટલામાટે તેઓ પોતાની મરજી પ્રમાણે તેની યાદગારી રાખવાને મુખ્યત્વાર છે ખરું. પણ ત્યારે તરતજ વધુ બાબત તપાસ માટે આપણું ધ્યાન માગે છે તે એકે ત્રણ કરોડની વસ્તી ઉપર હકુમત ચલાવતા એક હાકમની તેવી રીતે યાદગારી રાખવાનું કામ કીધાથી, પ્રજાને ગેરલાભ થવાની કાંઈ વધી છે કેમ? તે સવાલ પેહેલી અને મુખ્ય અગત ધરાવે

છે; અને તેના ઉપરથી તે કામ કરવા નીકળેલાઓની આગેવાની અર્થે કાળજીનું માપ પણ થઇ શકશે. શુદ્ધઆતમાં આપણે જવાળ આપીશું કે, તેવી રીતે યાદગારી રાખવાથી પ્રજાને મોટો ગેરલાભ થવાની વક્રી છે. લારડ હેરીસની યાદગારી દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓને નામે રાખવાથી, એવું જણાવવામાં આવશે કે, અકસર કરીને એવો અરથ નથી ઉઠતો કે તે નામદાર પ્રજા લાભનાં કામો કીધાં છે તે માટેજ તે રાખવામાં આવે છે: તેવાં કામ તેણે નથી કીધાં એવો અરથ તેમાંથી ઉભો કરીને “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ” એક વાર દેખાડી શકશે; પણ તેમનાથી એમ કહી શકવાનું નથી કે તેમનાં કામથી એવો પણ અરથ દુરની પ્રજાઓ કરી શકશે કે તેણે પ્રજાના ગેરલાભનાં કામો પણ કીધાં છે. “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ” એ કરેલી હીલચાલનો ઇલાકાની પ્રજાની તરફેણમાં જતો ધણીમાં ધણો અરથ એટલેજ કાઢાડી શકાશે કે પ્રજાને લાભ થાય એવાં કામો તે નામદારની હાકમીમાં નહીં થયાથી આખી પ્રજાએ તેને માન આપવાની તસ્દી લીધી નથી. પણ સાથે સાથે તે હીલચાલમાંથી એવો પણ વધુ સાર નીકળવો જોઇયે કે લારડ હેરીસ તે છતાં પ્રજાના ચહડતા વરગના લોકો વચ્ચે અને પ્રજાના આગેવાનો વચ્ચે એટલે તો માનીતો થઇ પડ્યો હતો, કે તેની યાદગારી રાખવાને તેઓએ વાજબી અને જરૂરનું વીચાર્યું છે. આ પ્રમાણેનો સાર નીકળવો જોઇયે તે કોઇથી ના પડાશે નહીં; પણ તે પછી ખીજે પણ સાર નીકળવો જોઇયે, અને તે તે યાદગારી રાખનારાઓએ કદાચ ધ્યાનમાં લીધો નહીં હશે. તે એવો નીકળવો જોઇયે કે જ્યારે ચહડતા વરગના અને પ્રજાના આગેવાન ગણ્યાતા દેશીઓએ તેમાં ભાગ લીધો છે, ત્યારે લારડ હેરીસની કારકીરદી એવી હોવી જોઇયે કે જે પ્રજાના મોટા જથ્થાએ કમસમજ અથવા કપટને લીધે બરોબર સમજી લીધી નહીં હશે; અને ચહડતા વરગનાં અને પ્રજાના આગેવાન ગણ્યાતાં દેશીઓએ તે બરાબર સમજેલી અને “ વખાણુવા ” જોગ માનેલી હોવાથીજ તેઓએ તેને માન આપ્યું છે તથા તેની યાદગારી કાયમ રાખવા જેવું કામ કર્યું છે.

અહીં નામદાર ગવરનરના દેશી “ દોસ્તો તથા વખાણુનારા ” મુખ્ય ઇલાકાની તમામ પ્રજાની સામે યર્થને ઉભા રહે છે. લારડ હેરીસની કારકીરદી સામટી ક્ષેત્રોમાં તેમાંનો થોડો ભાગ પ્રજાને નાખુશ કરનારો નીપજ્યો હોત, અને તેના લીધે પ્રજા તેને માન આપવાથી દુર યર્થ ખેડતાં તે કામ તેના દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓએ ઉઠાવી લીધું હોત, તો તે

વાત વળી જુદી હતી. પણ તેમ પણ નથી. સામટી રીતે બેતાં તેની કારકીરદી પ્રજને નીરાશ કરનારી નીવડી છે. તેની સામેતી પણ તેના ખીજા મીત્રોએ આપી હતી; અને તે અંગબળની કસરતને તેણે આપેલાં ઉત્તેજનની એકજ બાબત પકડીને તેને માન આપવાને કુરેલી હીલચાલમાં તેઓએ આપી હતી. લારડ હેરીસની પાંચ વરસની કારકીરદી માટે પુછ-પરછ કરવા જવાની જરૂર નથી. વરતમાનપત્રોની કટારો તેની પુરતી સાહેલત આપે છે. અને તેમના ઉપરથીજ અમો જે નોંધ થોડા દીવસો થયા ઉતારતા જઈએ છીએ તે ઉપરથી સેહેજમાં ખાતરી કરી લેવાને બની શકે છે. તેવી કારકીરદી જ્યારે જાણીતી છે અને તેથી પ્રજને ખમવું પડ્યું છે ત્યારે, પ્રજ જાણુવા માગશે કે, તે બાબતમાં અમારા આગેવાનોએ શું કર્યું છે? તે બાબત ઈંગલંડની પ્રજનાં ધયાન ઉપર અસરકારક રીતે લાગ જવાનો જ્યારે વખત આવી લાગ્યો છે, અને બીજા હાકમો અને અમલદારો તેવી રીતે કામ લેવાની અને તેમ કરીને પ્રજને ફરી નીરાશ કરવાની હીંમત નહીં કરે તે કારણસર ધડો આપવાની જોગવાઈ હાથ આવી છે, ત્યારે પ્રજના આગેવાનો તે કામ બજાવવાનું માંડી વાળે અને દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓનો પરદો મોહ ઉપર નાખી સામું એવું કામ કરે કે જેથી પ્રજને ભવીષ્યમાં મોટો ગેરલાભ થવાનો સંભવ રહે ત્યારે તેમને શું કેહેવું જોઈએ? તેમને કેવા પ્રકારના ગ્રહસ્થો કેહેવા જોઈએ? પ્રજાએ પોતે ત્યારે શું કરવું જોઈએ? અને પોતાના કેહેવાતા તેવા આગેવાનો માટે તેણે શું પગલાં ભરવાં જોઈએ?

આ સવાલો દરેક દેશીની છાતીમાં ઉભા થવા જોઈએ. નામદાર ગવર્નરના અંગ્રેજ દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓને અમો આ જગાએ ગણતરીમાં લેતા નથી. દેશી પ્રજના સંબંધમાં તેમના વીચારો જુદાજ છે, અને તે પ્રમાણે તેઓ મુદત થઈ કામ પણ લેતા આવયા છે; અને તે વાત તેઓ વળી છુપાવતા પણ નથી. પણ દેશી “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” ના સંબંધમાં તેમ કેહેવાશે નહીં. જ્યારે હોય ત્યારે તેઓ પ્રજના આગેવાન થઈ નીકળવા માગે છે; તે નામથી માન ખાટવા અને તે નામથી કેટલાંક કામો કહાડવા માગે છે. તેવી રીતે પ્રજ વચ્ચે દેખાવ કરતાં સ્ત્રીને હમણા જ્યારે તેઓ તેના હકમાં ગેરલાભ તથા નુકસાન થાય એવું કામ કરવા નીકળ્યા છે, ત્યારે પ્રજને પણ પોતાના બચાવમાં કાંઈ પગલાં ભરવાની જરૂર જણાવી જોઈએ, અને તેમાં જે કાંઈ તેણે કરવાનું રહેશે તે પોતાના બચાવમાંજ રહેશે તે સમજી લેવું મુશ્કેલ

પડવાનું નથી. સાંભળીને અમો ખુશી થયા નથી કે તેવી હીલચાલો અરેજ થવા પશુ લાગી છે. અમો કહીએ છીએ કે હીલચાલો, કારણ પ્રજના દેશી 'આગેવાનોએ' 'દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ' ના પરદા હેઠળ જે કામ માયે લીધું છે તે જુદી જુદી તરફ બહુ ખળખળાટ ઉભું કરવા લાગ્યું છે, અને તેથી જુદી જુદી તરફ જુદી જુદી હીલચાલો અને ધુસધુસ થવા લાગી છે. તે હીલચાલો એક સામટી હીલચાલનું રૂપ કદાચ લઈ લેશે, અથવા તો જુદી જુદી રીતે પોતાનું કામ ખળવી દેખાડશે. વળી લારડ હેરીસને માન આપવાની હીલચાલ સામેની હીલચાલ તરીકેજ તેમનું કામ પુરું થાય, એમ પણ ધારી શકાતું નથી. દેશી પ્રજના આગેવાનોમાં પોતાને ગણાવતા ગ્રહસ્થો પ્રજનો સ્વારથ બ્યાર ત્યાર બેદકારપણે બગાડી બેસવાની હીંમત નહીં કરે, તેના સંબંધમાં પણ વીચાર ચલાવવામાં આવતો જણાવવામાં આવે છે. તેનું પરીણામ ગમે તેવું આવે, પણ પ્રજને એક નવા પ્રકારનો આંચકો દેશી 'દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ'થી હાલ મળ્યો છે તેમાં શક નથી. તે પોતાના આગેવાનોને હસ્તક હાથપગથી બંધાધને હવે રહેતી દેખાય તે માટે તે ઉપરથી શક ઉપજે છે.

તા. ૧૭ મી જાનેવારી ૧૮૯૫.

૩

તનની કેળવણીને ઉત્તેજન આપવામાટે નામદાર ગવરનર લાર્ડ હેરીસને માન આપવાને લગતી પુણાના કેટલાક દેશી ગ્રહસ્થોએ કરેલી હીલચાલ—આ જાતની હી-લચાલની આગેવાની લેનારા પારસીઓની વરતણુંક ઉપરથી પારસી કોમના હકમાં શું પરીણામ નીપજવાની વધી દીસે છે ?



કીકેટની તથા ખીજી અંગબળની કસરતોને ઉત્તેજન આપવા માટે નામદાર ગવરનર લારડ હેરીસને જાહેર માન આપવાની જે હીલચાલ

મુ'બંધમાં કેટલાક ગ્રહસ્થોએ ઉભી કરી છે, તેને મળતીજ એક બીજી હીલચાલ પુણા મધે કેટલાક દેશી ગ્રહસ્થોએ ઉભી કરેલી અમો નોંધ્યે છીયે. ખાનખહાદુર દોરાબજી પદમજીનાં મકાનમાં તેં કારણસર ગયા મંગળવારને દીને તેઓએ એક સભા ભરી હતી, અને તેમાં યુનીવરસીટીના વાઇસ ચાનસેલર ડાક્ટર બંડારકરને પ્રમુખસ્થાન આપવામાં આવ્યું હતું. કીકેટ વગેરે અંગબળ ખીલવનારી રમતોને લારડ હેરીસે ઉત્તેજન આપ્યું છે તે સંબંધી સભામાં વીવેચન કરવામાં આવ્યા પછી એવો ઠરાવ પસાર કરવામાં આવ્યો હતો કે તે નામદારની યાદગારી રાખવા માટે મુ'બંધમાં જે ફૂડ ઉભું કરવામાં આવ્યું છે તેમાં ઉમેરવા માટે, પુણામાં જે કાંઇ રકમ એકઠી થાય તે મુ'બંધ મોકલી આપવી. પુણામાં કરવામાં આવતી હીલચાલ મુ'બંધમાં થયેલી હીલચાલોનાં એક સાંધણુ જેવી આ પ્રમાણે માલમ પડે છે; અને તે વીષે તેટલામાટે લંબાણુથી ટીકા કરવાની જરૂર રહેતી નથી. મુ'બંધમાં કરવામાં આવેલી હીલચાલ સામે નાપસંદગી બતાવતાં અમોએ આપેલા આ અભીપ્રાયમાં અમો મનજ્યુત થયા છીયે કે, તે હીલચાલ કરનારાઓ લારડ હેરીસને પ્રજા વચ્ચે સારી હાલતમાં મેલવા જેવું નથી કરતા. પ્રજા આગળ તેઓ ગોયા એવો એકરાર કરતાં જણાય છે કે તે નામદારને પ્રજાને નામે માન આપવા માટે, કીકેટ વગેરેને ઉત્તેજન આપવાનાં કામના કરતાં વધુ અગત ધરાવતાં બીજા કામો તેની કારકીરદીમાંથી મેળવવાં તેમને મુશ્કેલ લાગે છે. એક હાકમને માટે પ્રજાનાં મન ઉપર તેવી વાત ખામુખા ઠસાવવી, એ કામ તેને સાફ લગાડવા જેવું કેવી રીતે સમજવામાં આવશે ? તેવી રીતે જાહેર માન આપવાનો વીચારજ વીચીત્ર પ્રકારનો છે, અને તે વીચારથી કામ કરનારાઓ પોતાની દુરદેશી માટે પ્રજા વચ્ચે ચહડતું મત ઉત્પન્ન કરવાના નથી.

પણ મુ'બંધ તથા પુણા મધે કરવામાં આવેલી હીલચાલના સંબંધમાં, માઠાં ભાગ્યે, તેટલોજ વીચાર કરવાનો નથી. તેમાં આગેવાની ક્ષેનારાઓના સંબંધમાં, અને તેમાં અકસર કરીને પારસીઓ વીષે, પ્રજા વચ્ચે જે હુસહુસ થવા લાગી છે તે ઉપરથી એવો પણ ભય રાખવાને કારણુ રહે છે કે પારસી અને હીંદુ કોમો વચ્ચે વધતો ઓછો મતભેદ અથવા અણુગમે ચાલવા લાગેશે પણ કદાચ જેવો પડે. કાંઇ કાંઇ મતભેદ અથવા અણુગમે તો થોડો વખત થયો સપાટીની હેઠલ હસ્તી ધરાવતો અને કાંઇ કાંઇ બાહેર પ્રગટી નીકળતો પણ સાંભલવા તથા જોવામાં આવતો હતો; પણ મોટે ભાગે હમણા મુધી તે ઢંકાયેલો રહ્યો હતો. હવે

કદાચ તેને સારી રીતે પ્રગટી નીકળેલો આપણે જોવા લાગીશું; અને તે તે વેળા આજેવાનમાં ખપતા કેટલાક સાહેબો સામાન્ય પ્રજાના લાભની વીરૂઢનાં કામો કરી કેવું નુકસાન કરે છે તે સંબંધી જુદીજ સમજ તેમને પાડવા લાગશે. થોડાજ દીવસ થયા “ હીંદુસ્તાન ” નામનાં હીંદુ કલમથી લખાતાં વરતમાનપત્રમાં એક ખીના પ્રગટ થઇ હતી તે ઉપરથી જોવામાં આવ્યું હતું કે ગુજરાતના હીંદુઓ વચે પારસીઓ સામે કેવો અણુગમો ચાલવા લાગ્યો છે: વચમાં “ હીંદુ પ્રકાશ ” પત્રે મરાઠી હીંદુઓનો અભી-પ્રાય દરશાવ્યો હતો; અને ગઈ કાલે મળેલાં “ હિતેચ્છુ ” નામે હીંદુ કલમથી લખાતાં વરતમાનપત્રમાં જે લખાણુ પ્રગટ થયલું જોવામાં આવે છે તે પારસીઓના સંબંધમાં હીંદુ ભાઇઓ વચે થવા લાગેલા વીચારની પારસીઓને વધુ સમજ પાડવાને કામે લાગશે. “ હિતેચ્છુ ” ની તે ખીના અમોએ ખીજી તરફ લંબાણુથી પ્રગટ કરી છે, જે માહેથી અમારા પારસી વાંચનારાઓને વીચાર કરવા માટે ધણું મળી આવશે. પારસીઓએ તે ઉપર ધીરજથી ધ્યાન આપવાનું છે. હીંદુ ભાઇઓ કે મુસલમાન ભાઇઓ વચે તેમના વીષે જે કાંઈ વીરૂઢ વીચાર કરવામાં આવતો હોય, અને તેને લીધે આખી કોમ સામે જે અણુગમો ઉત્પન્ન થવાનો અને ચાલુ રહેવાનો સંભવ હોય, તે સામે અખાડા કરી બેસવા કરતાં તે જાણી લઇ તે ઉપર વીચાર કરવાની અને ભાઈબંધ કોમોને ઈનસાફ અને ધીરજ આપવાની અગત દીસે ત્યાં તે આપવાની જરૂર છે. તેથી પારસી કોમના હકમાં લાભજ થશે. હમણા જે વીચારો બાહર પ્રગટી નીકળ્યા છે તે કરતાં વધુ કડવાસ ધરાવતા વીચારો સપાટી હેઠળ ચાલતા હશે, એમ આપણે ધારવું જોઈયે. જાહેર કરવામાં આવેલા વીચારો વધારે ધ્યાન આપવા જેવા એટલામાટે દીસે છે કે પારસી કોમના અકાબર ગણાતા સાહેબો વટીક લારડ હેરીસની યાદગારીની હીલચાલમાં ભાગ લેવા મેદાન પડ્યા છે. પારસી કોમના સમજુઓએ જે વીચાર કરવાનો છે તે એ કે તે સાહેબોએ જે પગલાં બરયાં છે તે પારસીઓને સામાન્ય રીતે લાભ કરી આપે એવાં છે કે કેમ? એક કે ખીજી મોટી ભાઇબંધ કોમને પારસીઓ સામે અણુગમો ધરાવવાનું કારણુ મળે એ બહુજ દલગીરીભર્યું છે; પણુ તે કારણુ જે વજનદાર હોય તો પારસીઓએ તેને સંતોષ આપવાને ખોટી થવું જોઈતું નથી.

નામદાર ગવરનર લાર્ડ હેરીસની યાદગારી રાખવાનો
વીચાર કરવા માટે તે નામદારના “ દોસ્તો તથા
વખાણુનારાઓ ” ની ટાઉન હાલ મધે ગઈ પરમ
દીને મળેલી સભા—તેનાં બંધારણ તથા તે
મધે કરવામાં આવેલા ભાષણો ઉપરથી
થવું જોઈતું તેનું તોલ.

નામદાર ગવરનર લાર્ડ હેરીસની યાદગારી રાખવાનો વીચાર કરવા
માટે તેના “ દોસ્તો તથા વખાણુનારાઓ ” ની જે સભા ગઈ પરમ દીને
ટાઉન હાલમાં મળી હતી, તેને બને એટલું મોટું રૂપ આપવાને અંગ્રેજી
પત્રો બહુ ખતી જણાયાં છે. પ્રજાની સર્વ કોમોની એક મોટી જાહેર
સભા ભરવામાં આવી હોય, અને તે મધે થયેલાં ભાષણોની મારફતે લાર્ડ
હેરીસને પ્રજાનું બહુ કરનારો હાકમ પુરવાર કરવામાં આવ્યો હોય, એવો
કાંઈક દેખાવ તેમના તરફથી કરવામાં આવ્યો છે, અને તેથી બાહરની
પ્રજાઓ ભોળવાઈ જવાનો સંભવ પણ થોડો રહેતો નથી. પણ દેશી
પ્રજાનો વીચારવંત તથા અનુભવી ભાગ તેથી ઠગાઈ જશે એવી શંકા
અમો નથી રાખતા. અંગ્રેજી પત્રોએ સભાને આપવા માગેલી અગત
કટલી નાપાયદાર છે તે તે સભાનાં બંધારણ ઉપરથી જેમ જોઈ શકવાને
બની આવે છે, તેમ તે મધે કરવામાં આવેલાં ગોળ ગોળ અને ધડપુછડાં
વગરનાં ભાષણો પણ તેનો થોડો મજબૂત પૂરાવો નથી આપતાં. પણ તે
ઉપરાંત ત્રીજી જે બાબત ઉપરથી તે સભાને આપવામાં આવતી અગત્યનું
નાપાયદારપણું જોઈ શકવાનું છે, અને જેના ઉપર અમો પ્રથમ બોલીશું,
તે અંગ્રેજી પત્રોએ કરેલી સભાની ભારે મોટી તારીફ છે. દેશી પ્રજાના
વીચારવંત ભાગને વરસો થયાં એટલો અનુભવ તો સારીપેટ મળ્યો છે
કે દેશી પ્રજાના એકસ એકસ લાભો વધારવાનાં કામો તથા હિલચાલોને,
અંગ્રેજી પત્રો તથા હિંદી અંગ્રેજી તથા હિંદી અંગ્રેજ અમલદારો અથવા
કોમના મોટા ભાગ તરફથી ટેકો મળતો નથી. તેઓ તેમને ટેકો આપતાં

તો નથીજ, પણ સામાં તેમને તોડી પાડવાની તજવીજ કરતાં જોવામંદ આવે છે. બલા હાકમોને માન આપવાની તથા નુકસાન કરનાર નીવડેલા હાકમો સામે અભીપ્રાય ઉચારવાની બાબત ઉપરથીજ પતીજ કરનારો તેનો દાખલો મળી આવે છે. ગયાં પંદર વરસનો છતીહાસ તપાસી જોતાં માલમ પડશે કે મુ'બઈના જે જે ગવરનરો તથા હીંદુસ્તાનના જે જે વાઈસરાયોના અમલથી દેશી પ્રજાએ પોતાનું બહુ થયલું સમજી તેમને માન આપ્યું હતું, તે તે ગવરનરો તથા વાઈસરાયો સામે હીંદી અંગ્રેજ પત્રો તથા કોમના મોટા ભાગે ખુલી અને સખત શત્રુવદ બતાવી હતી; અને જે જે ગવરનરો તથા વાઈસરાયોની કારકીરદીથી પોતાને નુકસાન થયલું જણાવી દેશી પ્રજાએ તેમની સામે અણુગમે બતાવ્યો હતો, તેમના ઉપર હીંદી અંગ્રેજ પત્રો તથા કોમનો મોટો ભાગ શીદા થતો રહ્યો હતો. વાઈસરાયોનો દાખલો પહેલાં લેતાં બલા લાર્ડ રીપનની કારકીરદીથી પોતાના ઉપર આશીરવાદો ઉતરેલા ગણી દેશી પ્રજાએ જ્યારે તેના ઉપર પોતાનાં હેશાનનો ઉભરો ખાલી કરવામાં કશું બાકી રાખ્યું ન હતું, ત્યારે હીંદી અંગ્રેજ પત્રો તથા કોમના મોટા ભાગે તે નામદારને વગોવવામાં, હેરાન કરવામાં તથા ગાળો દેવામાં કસુર કરી ન હતી. લાર્ડ ડફ્રીને બાહેરના સારા દેખાવના પરદા હેઠળ પ્રજાને અનેક પ્રકારનું નુકસાન કરેલું જોયાથી દેશીઓ તેનાથી જ્યારે નારાજ થયા હતા, ત્યારે હીંદી અંગ્રેજ પત્રો તથા કોમે તેના ઉપર પસંદગી બતાવી હતી. લાર્ડ લેનસ્ટાઉને લગભગ સઘળાં પોતાનાં અગતનાં કામોથી દેશી લાભ ડુબાડવા જેવું કર્યાથી દેશી પ્રજાએ જ્યારે ત્રાસ પોકાર્યો હતો, ત્યારે હીંદી અંગ્રેજ પત્રો તથા કોમનો મોટો ભાગ તેના ઉપર એવો શીદા થયો હતો કે તેને માટે આવલું ઉલું કરવાને પણ તે ચુક્યો નહી. લાર્ડ એલ-ગીન હજી નવો સવો છે, તોપણ પોતાના અમલની શુરઆતમાં પોતાની રાજનીતીના ઢેલકાક ઉદાર નીયમો જાહેર કરી દેશીઓને તેણે જ્યારે આશાવંત કર્યા છે, ત્યારે હીંદી અંગ્રેજ પત્રો તથા હીંદી અંગ્રેજ અમલદારોના મોટા ભાગે તેને સત્તાવવાની શુરઆત કરી છે. દેશના વડા હાકમોની કારકીરદીનું તોલ હીંદી અંગ્રેજો તથા દેશી પ્રજા આ પ્રમાણે સામસામા છેડા ઉપર ઉભા રહીને કરતાં ચાલ્યાં છે; અને તેટલોજ મોટો અંતર ગવરનરોનું તોલ કરવાની બાબતમાં પણ તેમના વચે પડેલા મુ'બઈમાં તેમજ બીજી તરફ આપણે જોતાં ચાલ્યા છીએ. મુ'બઈના માજી ગવરનર સર જેમ્સ ફરમયુસનની નબળાઈ તથા પ્રજાના વધારાની આડે પડવા જેવી

વરતણ્ણકને લીધે મુ'બઈની દેશી પ્રજાએ તેની કારકીરદીની વીરૂધ્ધ જ્યારે પોતાનો અભીપ્રાય આપ્યો હતો, ત્યારે હીંદી અંગ્રેજ પત્રો તથા કોમના મોટા ભાગની નજરમાં તે પસંદ પડતો થઈ લાગ્યો હતો. તેની પછી આવેલા હાકમ લાર્ડ રેના બહા ગુણો તથા સામાન્ય રીતે ક્ષેતાં તેની કારકીરદી ઉપરથી દેશી પ્રજાએ જ્યારે તેના તરફ માન અને પ્રીતિ બતાવી હતી, ત્યારે હીંદી અંગ્રેજ પત્રો અને કોમનો લગભગ સધળો ભાગ તેને વખોડવા લાગ્યો હતો, અને કેટલોક ભાગ તો તેને બદનામ કરવા તથા ગાળો દેવાને પણ ચુક્યો ન હતો. લાર્ડ હેરીસના પુરા થવા આવેલા અમલમાં તે કરતાં જુદી સ્થિતિ આપણે જોઈ નથી. તે નામદારના અમલનાં ધણા-ખરાં સધળાં અમલતાં કામો ઉપરથી દેશી પ્રજા જ્યારે નીરાશી જાહેર કરતી માલમ પડી છે, ત્યારે હીંદી અંગ્રેજ પત્રો તથા હીંદી અંગ્રેજ કોમનો મોટો ભાગ તેની વખાણુ ગાતો ચાલ્યો છે. વાઇસરાયો જોડે ગવર્નરોની હાકમીનું તોલ કરવાની બાબતમાં પણ તે રીતે દેશી પ્રજા તથા હીંદી અંગ્રેજ કોમ સામસામી લાગણી તથા વીચાર ધરાવીને કામ ક્ષેતી ચાલી છે. બંને વચ્ચે વીચાર અને લાગણીનો ભારે મોટો અંતર દેખાડનારી તે સ્થિતિ બચીત અફસોસ કરવા જેવીજ છે, નોપણુ આટલું તે ઉપરથી સમજી ક્ષેતું મુસ્કેલ પડતું નહીં જોઈએ કે, એક હાકમના સંબંધની જે હીલચાલ હીંદી અંગ્રેજ પત્રોની કે હીંદી અંગ્રેજ અમલદારો તથા કોમની પસંદગી મેળવવાં પામી હોય તે દેશી પ્રજાની પસંદગી અથવા તેના લાભની હોતી નથી. ગઈ પરમની સભાના સંબંધમાં તે ધોરણે તપાસ કરતાં એવો સાર કાઢાડવો બેહુદું થઈ પડતું જોઈએ કે, અંગ્રેજ પત્રોએ તેને જ્યારે સારીપેઠે વખાણી છે તેમજ હીંદી અંગ્રેજ અમલદારો તથા વેપારીઓએ તે સભાને ઉભી કરવામાં મુખ્ય ભાગ લીધો છે ત્યારે તેને સાથે સાથે દેશી પ્રજાના પણ વીચાર અથવા લાગણી દરશાવતી સમજવી.

તેટલી વાત વળી સભાનાં બંધારણુ ઉપરથી પણ બરાબર જોઈ લેવાને બની આવે છે. તેમાં મુલતાનીઓ અને મારવાડીઓ તથા પોર-દુગીઓ અને યાહુદીઓ પણ સારી જેવી સંખ્યામાં હાજર થયા હતા એવું જણાવી ભાષ્યમંધ ટાઇમ્સ આફ ઈન્ડિયા વડાઈ લે છે; પણ તેના સંબંધમાં દેશીઓને સમજ પાડવાની અગત રહી નથી કે જાહેર બાબતો વીધે વીચાર કરવાની સમજ તથા શક્તિ નહીં ધરાવતા પ્રજાના વરગોને ગમે એટલી મોટી સંખ્યામાં એક ઠેકાણે લાવીને બેસાડવાનું કામ આજના વખતમાં મુશ્કેલ નથી. તેવા નીરદોષ દેશીઓને તેમના લાભની વીરૂધ્ધ

જતાં ગમે એવાં નુકસાનકારક કામમાં સામેલ કરવાને ઇચ્છવામાં આવે તો, લાગવગ વગેરેનું બળ ધરાવતા થોડા સાહેબોની ઈસારતજ તે ખરે પુરતી થવી જોઈએ. તેવા નીરદોશોને ત્યારે બાબુએ રાખતાં તેમજ મ્યુનીસીપાલિટીના અંગ્રેજ તથા દેશી અમલદારો અને કેટલાક અંગ્રેજ વેપારીઓને ગણતરીમાં નહીં લેતાં, ગદ્ય પરમની સભામાં સામેલ થયલા દેશીઓમાંથી પારસી સીવાય બીજી કોમોની આગેવાનોનું પ્રમાણ બહુજ નાનું જણાશે. તેટલા થોડા આગેવાનો પણ પ્રજા લાભને ઉપદેશ મારવા જેવાં કામમાં સામેલ થયા એ બીના ખચીત થોડી અફસોસ કરવા જેવી બની નથી. લાર્ડ હેરીસના અમલનો ઈતીહાસ લખતાં, તેમની તેમજ પારસી કોમના આગેવાનોની જે મોટી સંખ્યા ગદ્ય પરમની સભામાં સામેલ થઈ હતી તેમની વરતણુંક સામે થોડી નફારી નોંધ કરવામાં નહીં આવશે. વળી પારસી કોમના આગેવાનોએ ચલાવેલી વરતણુંકને લીધે તેમની કોમને બીજી રીતે નુકસાન થવાનો ભય રાખવો પડે છે તે પણ આપણે ભુલી જઈશું નહીં. પણ તે સઘળું છતાં દેશી પ્રજાના આગેવાનોનો એક સારો ભાગ સભામાં સામેલ થવાથી દુર રહ્યો છે તેમજ લાર્ડ હેરીસના અમલ સામે દેશી પ્રજા તરફથી નાપસંદગીનો અવાજ મજબુતી સાથે નીકળ્યો છે, તેટલી બીના ઉપરથી અપેક્ષાતપણે અવલોકન કરનારાઓ જોઈ લેશે કે ગઈ પરમની સભાને દેશી પ્રજાના વીચારો તથા લાગણીઓ દરશાવતી જણાવવી એ નહીં હતી વાતને આગળ કરવા જેવુંજ છે.

ગઈ પરમની સભામાં કરવામાં આવેલાં બાષણોમાં નામદાર લાર્ડ હેરીસની કારકીરદીને જે રૂપમાં ચીતારવામાં આવી હતી તે ઉપર તે પછી ધ્યાન આપીશું તો, સભાને આપવામાં આવેલી અગતનું પોકળ તથા પ્રજા મતથી તે કેટલી ગુદી પડી છે તે જોઈ લેવાને થોડો ખોરાક મળશે નહીં. પણ તે વીધે હવે પછી.

તારીખ ૩૧ મી જાનેવારી સને ૧૮૯૫.

નામદાર લાઈ હેરીસના “દોસ્તો તથા વખાણુના-
રાઓ”ની ટાઉન હાલમાં મલેલી સભાં દેશી પ્રજનું
મત તથા લાગણી દરશાવતી નથી તેનું ખીલું
કારણ—તે નામદારની કારકીરદી વીષે તે
સભા મધે કરવામાં આવેલું ગોળ ગોળ,
અધુરું અને ઘડપુછડાં વગરનું વીવેચન.

નામદાર ગવરનર લાઈ હેરીસની યાદગારી રાખવાનો વીચાર કરવા
માટે તે નામદારના “દોસ્તો તથા વખાણુનારાઓ”ની ગયા મંગળવારે
મળેલી સભા દેશી પ્રજનું મત તથા લાગણી દરશાવતી નથી તેને લગતાં
કેટલાંક કારણો ગઇ કાલના અંકમાં આપ્યા પછી, આજ દીને તેને લગતાં
વધુ કારણો તે સભા મધે કરવામાં આવેલાં ભાષણો ઉપરથી આપણે
જોઇ લઇશું. તે ભાષણો જેમ ગોળ ગોળ અને ઘડપુછડાં વગરનાં હતાં,
તેમ લાઈ હેરીસની કારકીરદી સંબંધી તે ઉપરથી કહાડી બતાવવામાં
આવેલો સાર પ્રજા વચે બાંધવામાં આવેલા અભીપ્રાયથી તદ્દન ઉલટોજ
જોવામાં આવશે. તે નામદારના અમલ દરમ્યાન કેવાં કેવાં કામો કરવામાં
આવ્યાં છે તે ઉપર અહીં વીગતે ઉતરવાની જરૂર અમારે માટે રહી
નથી: દહાડા વાર સહીત તથા વીગતે તેની નોંધ વાંચનારાઓ આગળ
કટકે કટકે અમે મેલતા જઇએ છીએ, જે ઉપરથી તે સંબંધાં કામો
તેમની યાદમાં તાળાં થતાં જતાં હશે. અને તે વીગત જોયા પછી ટાઉન
હાલમાં થયેલાં ભાષણો ઉપર તેઓ જ્યારે નેધાહ પહોંચાડશે, ત્યારે તેમને
એક હાથ ઉપર રમુજ અને ખીજા હાથ ઉપર કેટલોક અપ્રસોસ લાગ્યા
ખીના રહેશે નહીં. ટાઉન હાલમાં જેમ મળેલા નામદાર ગવરનરના “દોસ્તો
અને વખાણુનારાઓ” પોતાની દોસ્તી અને વખાણુને એટલી હદ સુધી
લઇ ગયલા જણાય છે કે તે નામદારના અમલમાં થયેલાં પ્રજાને નીરાશ
તથા દુખી કરવા જેવાં કામોમાંથી એક પણ કામને હાથ ધરી ખુલાસો
આપવાની યાદ તેમને રહી ન હતી. તેવાં કામોની સંખ્યા તપાસ કરતાં

વળી નાની જણાશે નહીં. તેમના ઉપરથી આટલું સમજી લેવું મુશ્કેલ પડતું નહીં જોઈએ કે ટાઉન હાલમાં મળેલા સાહેબોએ લાર્ડ હેરીસની કારકીરદીની તપાસ પેહેલાં તો બહુજી અધુરેપણે ચલાવી હતી; અને ખીજું, તે કારકીરદી મધેનાં જે કામો લખે તેઓએ લાર્ડ હેરીસની બારે વખાણ કરી હતી તેમના ઉપર વીવેચન કરતાં તેઓએ દુરદેશી કે ચોક્કસાર્થનો ઉપયોગ બરાબર કર્યો ન હતો. મુખ્ય જે એક કામને જુદા જુદા બોલનારાઓએ સારી પેઠે ચહાવ્યું હતું તે ક્રીકેટ વગેરે રમત ગમતોને ઉત્તેજન આપવાને લગતું હતું. તે એકજ કામને આગલ કરી લાર્ડ હેરીસને લોકપ્રીય ઠરાવવાની તજવીજ કરનારાઓ તે નામદારને પ્રજા વચે કેવું માફુ લગાડે છે તે વીષે આગલા અંકમાં અમે ફરી ફરીથી બોલી ગયલા હોવાથી અહીં એટલુંજ જણાવી સંતોષ પકડીશું કે તે ઉપર બાર મેલવામાં ટાઉન હાલમાં ભેગા મળેલા સાહેબોએ દુરદેશી વાપરી ન હતી. ક્રીકેટ ઉપરાંત ખીજી જે બાબતોને યાદ કરી તેઓએ લાર્ડ હેરીસની વખાણ કરી હતી તેમાં મુખ્ય કેળવણી, યુનીસીપાલીટીઓ, તથા જંગલખાતાંને લગતી તેની સરકારની કારકીરદીને રજુ કરવામાં આવેલી જણાય છે. પણ તેમના સંબંધમાં પણ જોઈએ અમે અજબ થયા નથી કે લાર્ડ હેરીસની તરફેણમાં જની થોડીક ખીના આગલ કરી તેની વીરુધ્ધ જતી ઘણી ખીના તેઓને પડતીજ મેલવી પડી હતી. કેળવણી વીષે બોલતાં, દાખલા તરીકે તેઓએ એમ જણાવ્યું હતું કે મુજ તથા ઉંચાં ધોરણની તેમજ હુન્નર ઉદ્યોગની કેળવણીને લાર્ડ હેરીસે ઉત્તેજન આપ્યું હતું; પણ આ વાત ઉપર તેઓએ અખાડાજ કર્યા હતા કે, જુદા જુદાં પ્રકારની કેળવણી પાછળ વધુ ખર્ચ કરવાની વડાધ સરકારી ઠરાવમાં તથા ખીજી તરફ લીધાં છતાં, સરકારી હીસાબ તપાસી જોતાં તે વડાધ ઘણે દરજ્જે પોકલ માલમ પડી હતી. વલી ટેકનીકલ ઇનસ્ટીટ્યુટ એટલે હુન્નરની કેલવણીને જે વધુ મદદ આપવા વીષે સભામાં જણાવવામાં આવ્યું હતું તે, યુનીવરસીટીને એટલે ચહડતાં ધોરણની કેળવણીને મળતી મદદમાં ઘટાડો કરીનેજ આપવામાં આવી હતી. યુનીવરસીટીને આપવામાં આવતી મદદમાં રૂપયા પાંચ હજારનો ઘટાડો કરવામાં આવ્યો હતો એટલુંજ નહીં, પણ તે મદદ આપવી સમુળી બંધ કરવાની ચેતવણી વટીક તેને આપવામાં આવી ચુકી છે. મી૦ જ્યારજ કાટન તથા ડાકટર બંડારકર તે વાત બીલકુલ જુલ્મી ગયલા જણાય છે. તેજ પ્રમાણે યુનીસીપાલીટીઓ પ્રત્યેની લાર્ડ હેરીસની સરકારની કારકીરદીની વખાણ આનારાઓ જુલ્મી ગયા હતા કે સુબંધની કારપોરેશન સામે ક્રંદાં

કલમનો ઉપયોગ કરવાની આપખુદી, કારપોરેશનના ઇતીહાસમાં ધણું વરસના ખાંચા પછી લાઈ હેરીસેન્ઝ ચલાવી છે; અને તે ઉપરાંત પોલીસના ખર્ચને લગતા વાંધા ઉપરથી કારપોરેશન તથા સરકાર વચ્ચેનો સંબંધ એટલે કડવાસભરયો થઈ પડ્યો છે કે નવા ગવર્નર ' લાઈ સેંડરસ્ટને આપવા માટે કારપોરેસને તૈયાર કરેલાં માનપત્રમાં તે વીષે ઈસારો વટીક તેણે કરવાનો છોડી દીધો નથી. જંગલખાતાંને લગતી લાઈ હેરીસની રાજનીતીની વખાણ કરતી વેળા પણ, તે કરનારાઓએ ઉપર ઉપરથી માત્ર ઠીંગડું મારવા જેવીજ તળવીજ કરી હતી. તેઓ કદાચ ભુલી ગયા હશે કે પ્રજા તરફ કેટલીક છુટ મેલી કામ લેવા જેવો ઠરાવ લાઈ હેરીસની સરકારે જોકે એક વરસે કર્યો હતો તોપણ, તે ઠરાવ સામે અંગ્રેજી પત્રો મારફતે અવાજ નીકળ્યાથી, ખીજેજ વરસે ગરીબો ઉપર દયા કરવાની ઉલટ પાછી નરમ પડી ગયલી જેવામાં આવી હતી. લાઈ હેરીસની કારકીરદીનાં બહુજ થોડાં કામો હાથ ધરતાં પણ, તેવી તેવી અગતની વાતો જુદા જુદા બોલનારાઓ ભુલી ગયા હતા, જે ખીના તેમની ખર્ચદારી અથવા અપક્ષપણા માટે સાઈ' મત અધાવવાને તો કામે લાગશેજ નહીં: તે ઉપરથી એટલું સમજી લેવામાં આવશે કે નામદાર લાઈ હેરીસને જેમ તેમ કરીને કાંઈ માન અપાવવાને ખાતર તેનાં " દોસ્તો તથા વખાણનારાઓ "એ સઘળી તસ્દી ઉઠાવેલી હોવી જોઈએ, અને તેટલી નેમ તેઓએ કાંઈ પણ કરીને પાર પાડી બતાવી છે. તેમાં તેઓએ ઠીક ઠીંમત અને ખંત બતાવી છે; પણ લાઈ હેરીસને માટે અથવા પોતાને માટે પ્રજા વચ્ચે તેથી ચહડતું મત ઉત્પન્ન કરવાને તેઓ શક્તીવાન થયા નથી.

લાઈ હેરીસના " દોસ્તો અને વખાણનારાઓ "ને જે સવાલ હવે કરવાનો રહે છે તે એ કે, દોસ્તીની રાહ નામદાર ગવર્નરના ગુણો નહીં ઘટે એટલી હદ સુધી જઈને પણ તેઓએ જ્યારે ગાઈ બતાવ્યા છે ત્યારે જુદી જુદી જે બાબતોમાં તે નામદારે પ્રજાને રંજીત કરી હતી અને જેમના વીષે કાંઈ પણ બોલવાના તેઓ અખાડાજ કરી ગયા છે, તેમનાં સંબંધમાં જુદીજ રીતે ખર્ચ લઈ પ્રજા મધેના લખોની સંખ્યાથી ગણ્યામ એવા પોતાના નાચાર બાઈબંધોની તરફથી પણ તેઓ કાંઈ ફરજ અદા કરવા માગે છે કે કેમ. મોટી પદવીના હાકમને મીઠાસ પીરસી રાજી કરવાના કામ જેટલું તે કામ સેહેલ નથી; પણ ઠીંમત અને પુન્યતું કામ તો તેજ છે. પણ તે તેઓ બળવે એમ તેમની વરતાણુંક ઉપરથી

આશા રાખવી ફેાકટજ દીસે છે. પ્રજના દુરંદેશ તથા સ્વતંત્ર ગ્રહસ્થાને સારે અમારે આગ્રહ છે કે લાર્ડ હેરીસની કારકીરદીની ખીજ બાબુનો ચીતાર આ દેશની તથા બાહરની પ્રજાઓ આગળ ખુલ્લી રીતે સ્તુ કરવાનું કામ, તેઓએ હવે ઉપાડી લેવાની તરદી ઉઠાવવી.

અને તે એકજ કામ બજાવવાનું તેમને માથે આવી પડ્યું નથી. તેટલુંજ અગત્યું ખીજું જે કામ તેઓએ બજાવવું જોઈશે તે ગયા મંગળવારની સભામાં સામેલ થયલા જુદી જુદી કોમોના અને અકસર કરી પારસી કોમના આગેવાનોની, તથા પ્રજાની મદદ મેળવીને તથા ખીજ રીતે સરકારી ઓથે અધીકારે ચહરેલા સાહેબોની, વરતણુંક વીધે પ્રજા પાસે તેના અભીપ્રાયની નોંધ લેવાડવાનું છે. તે કામ તેઓએ બજાવવાની અગત પ્રજના લાભ માટે ફેટલી મોટી છે તે વીધે હવે પછી બોલવાનો ધરાદો અમે રાખ્યે છીયે.

તા૦ ૧ લી ફેબ્રુવારી સને ૧૮૯૫.

૬

નામદાર ગવરનરની યાદગારી રાખવાના ફંડમાં નાણાં
ભરનારાઓની ટીપમાં એક વેપારી પેહેડીનું નામ
દાખલ કરવામાં આવ્યાથી તેના તરફથી
લેવામાં આવતો વાંધો.



મુખ્ય સમાચારના અધીપતી જોગ,

સાહેબ,—જત આજના તમારા પત્રમાં લાર્ડ હેરીસના વખાણનારા તથા ચાહનારાઓએ તેની યાદગારીમાં ભરેલાં નાણાંની ટીપ તમોએ છાપી છે, તે મધે અમારા નામ ઉપર રૂ ૫૧ ની રકમ જોઈને અમેને અજાયબી પેદા થઇ છે. અમેને ત્યારે એ ૫૨માં નાણાં ભરવાને અરજ કરવામાં આવી ત્યારે અમેએ ઘણી આનાકાતીથી એક નાની રકમ ભરી, કે જે અમેને દુબાણ કરનારાઓને પસંદ આવી નહી, તેથી તે અમેએ અમારા હાથે છોડી નાખી છે, અને હવે તમારા પત્રમાં જે રકમ આવી છે તે જોઈને અમેને અચરતી પેદા થાય છે. તેથી આ પત્ર લખીને તમો સાહેબને તરદી આપી છે તે માફ કરજો.

દાણા બંદર, માંડવી, મુખ્ય, તા૦ ૩૧ મી જાન્યુવારી ૧૮૯૫.

ધારસી નાનજીની કુ૦.

નામદાર લાઈ હેરીસના “દોસ્તો તથા વખાણુનારાઓ”
 ની ટાઉન હાલમાં મળેલી સભામાં સામેલ થયલા
 જુદી જુદી કોમોના આગેવાનો તથા સરકારી
 ઓધે અધીકારે ચહડેલા દેશી અમલદાર-
 રોની વરતણુંક વીધે પ્રજા વચે
 કેવો અલીપ્રાય અપાવાનો
 સંભવ રહેછે ?

નામદાર ગવરનર લાઈ હેરીસના “દોસ્તો તથા વખાણુનારાઓ”
 ની ગયા મંગળવારે ટાઉન હાલમાં મળેલી સભાના સંબંધમાં જે વધું
 આપતનો પીચાર કરવાનો છે, અને જે વીધે ગદ્ય કાલના અંકમાં અમોએ
 કર્યો હતો, તે તે ઈશારો સભામાં સામેલ થયલા જુદી જુદી કોમોના
 તથા અક્સર કરી પારસી કોમના કેટલાક આગેવાનોની, તથા
 પ્રજાના ટેકાથી સરકારી ઓધે અધીકારે ચહડેલા કેટલાક સાહેબોની વરત-
 ણુંકને લગતી છે. ગઈ પરમના અંકમાં અમો જણાવી ગયા છીએ કે
 સભા મધે હાજર થયલા હીંદુ તથા મોહમેદન કોમોના આગેવાનોની સં-
 ખ્યા જ્યારે બહુ નાની જણાતી, ત્યારે પારસી કોમના આગેવાનો તે મધે
 સારી જેવી સંખ્યામાં હાજર થયા હતા. પારસી કોમના વડા અકાબરો
 સર જમશેદજી જીજીભાઈ તથા સર દીનશાહજી માણેકજી પીટીટ વટીક
 સભામાં હાજર થવાથી પાછળ રહ્યા ન હતા; અને તેઓએ જ્યારે તેમાં
 હાજરી આપી, ત્યારે તેમનાં લાગતાવળગતા અથવા તેમની સાથ સંબંધ
 ધરાવતા જુદા જુદા ધણા સાહેબો પણ તેમાં સામેલ થયા તેટલી વાતમાં
 વધી ઉપરાંત વધુ બનેલું સમજવાનું નથી. અને તેઓ સીવાય સરકારી
 ઓધે અધીકારે ચહડેલા કેટલાક સાહેબો પણ સભામાં ખીરાજમાન થયાથી,
 પારસી કોમના આગેવાનોમાં ખપતા તથા ખીજા જાણીતા પ્રહસ્યોનું બહુ
 મોટું તથા સભામાં જમાવ થવાનો દેખાવ થઈ રહ્યો હતો. સરકારી
 ઓધે અધીકારે ચહડેલા જે સાહેબો સભામાં હાજર થયા હતા તેમને પ્રથમ

બાળુએ રાખી, આપણે તપાસીશું કે અકાબરો તથા આગેવાનોમાં ખપતા
 જુદી જુદી કામોના સાહેબોએ પ્રજા તરફની પોતાની ફરજ કેવી રીતે
 અદા કરી છે. કામના આગેવાન થયા એટલે, આંટલું તો કમુલ રાખવામાં
 આવશે કે, તેમની ફરજ કામ તથા પ્રજાના લાભો સાચવવા તરફ પેહેલાં
 રહેવી જોઈએ, અને બીજી ઉતરતા પ્રકારની ફરજોની આગમજ તે ફરજ
 તેઓએ પેહેલી બળવવા ઘટે છે. ગવરનર સાહેબના અંગત દોસ્તો અને
 વખાણુનારા જેઓ હોય તેઓ દોસ્તીનો હક ઘટતી હદમાં રહી ખાનગી
 કે જાહેર રીતે અદા કરે, તે સામે પ્રજાએ વાંધો લેવા જેવું છે નહીં ;
 પણ પ્રજાના આગેવાનમાં ખપી ખુદ પ્રજાના ભોગે અથવા તેના લાભોને
 નુકસાન પહોંચે તેવી રીતે તે ફરજ તેઓ અદા કરવા નીકળે, ત્યારે તેઓ
 આગેવાનના અધિકારને લાયક છે કે કેમ તે બીના પુછપરછ કરવા જેવીજ
 થઈ પડવી જોઈએ. નામદાર લાર્ડ હેરીસની કારકીરદીમાં થયેલા ઘણાં
 ઘણાં કામો પ્રજાને નુકસાન કરવા તથા તેને રંજા કરવા જેવાં નીવડ્યાં
 છે. એટલી વાત તો સાધારણ ખબરદારી ધરાવતા મુબઈના કોઈ પણ
 દેશીથી અજાણી રહી નથી. તે કામોમાં કેટલાંક એવા પણ થયાં છે કે
 જેમાં પ્રજાનો સાદો ઈનસાફ કે સાદો સંતોષ આપવાની બાબતમાં વડીક
 પાછળ પડવામાં આવ્યું હતું; અને પ્રજા પ્રત્યે કામ લેવાની બાબતમાં તેથી
 તે નુકસાનકારક અથવા અઘડીત નીયમો આલવાનો નાપસંદ દેખાવ
 આપણને જોવો પડ્યો હતો. તેવાં કામોના સંબંધમાં પ્રજાના આગેવા-
 નોની ફરજ તેમની સામે ખુદથી રીતે વાંધો દરશાવી હવે પછીના
 હાકમો સાવચેત રહે તેવા કાંઈ ઉપાય લેવા અથવા હિલચાલ કરવાનીજ
 રહેવી જોઈએ. પણ ટાઉન હાલમાં ભેગા મળેલા આગેવાન તથા અકાબ-
 રમાં ખપતા સાહેબોએ તેવું કશું કરેલું જણાતું નથી. અને તેવું કશું
 નહીં કરતાં લુલી લાંગડી બીનાઓ આગળ કરી નામદાર ગવરનરની તારીફ
 ગામનેજ બાળુએ બેઠાથી, પ્રજાને નીરાશ તથા દુખી કરવા માટે
 એક જાતનું ઉત્તેજન હવે પછીના હાકમોને આપવા જેવું કામ
 તેઓએ કરેલું કાંહેનહી ગણાય ? ગવરનરની તારીફ કરી ઉઠેલા કેટલાક
 સાહેબો જે મોટાં નામો ધરાવે છે તેને લીધે, ટાઉન હાલની સભાના
 અંગ્રેજ પત્રોએ આપેલા સહરાવેલા હેવાલો ઈંગ્લંડ પહોંચતાં, ત્યાંની
 પ્રજા લાર્ડ હેરીસની કારકીરદી તથા પ્રજાના તે સંબંધી અભીપ્રાયની
 બાબતમાં બ્રમાઈ જવાનો તથા પ્રજાને તેથી નુકસાન થવાનો સંભવ
 વળી શું થોડો છે ? અને તે સામે એ સાહેબો કેલા ઉપાય લેવા માગે

છે ? એવા એવા સવાલો ટાઉન હાલની સભામાં સામેલ થયલા પ્રજાના કેટલાક આગેવાનો અને અકાબરોની વરતણુક ઉપરથી ઉભા થયા વીના રહેતા નથી; અને તે સવાલો વળી એવા છે કે જેમને કુડ્યો કરવા વીના ઉભા રાખી શકાશે નહીં. એજ આગેવાનો અને અકાબરો પ્રજા લાભને હવે પછી ઉધા મારવા જેવાં કામો કરવા બેઠકારપણે ઉતરી નહીં પડે તે માટે, જુદી જુદી સરવ કોમોના દુરદેશ ગ્રહસ્થોએ સાથે મળી કાંઈ હીલચાલ કરવાની જરૂર બહુ મોટી દીસે છે; અને તે કામ ધીરજ રાખીને તથા શાંત મને તેઓએ હવે બજાવવું જોઈશે. અકસર કરી પારસી કામ વચેના સ્વતંત્ર અતે દુરદેશ ગ્રહસ્થોને તે ફરજ ઉપાડી લેવાનો આગ્રહ અમે કરીએ છીએ. સામાન્ય પ્રજાના ભવીષ્યના લાભ માટે તેઓએ તે ફરજ જેમ ઉપાડી લેવાની છે તેમ પોતાની કામનાં ભવીષ્યનો વીચાર કરી તે પણ તે કામ તેઓએ કરવાનું છે. તેઓ સારીપેઠે સમજતા હોવા જોઈએ કે તેમની કામની આ દેશ મધેની સ્થિતી, બાઈબંધ કોમો સાથના તેના આગલાપાછલા સંબંધ તથા તેમના તરફની તેની ફરજો વગેરે ધ્યાનમાં લેતાં, એવી છે કે વખતસર ઘટતે રસ્તે કામ લેવામાં નહીં આવ્યું તો આગળ ચાલતાં તેને જુદી જુદી રીતે થોડું ખમવું પડવાનો સંભવ રહેશે નહીં.

દેશી કોમોના આગેવાનો તથા અકાબરો ઉપરાંત સરકારી ઓધે અધીકારે ચહડેલા તથા આગેવાનોમાં ખપતા જે ખીજ સાહેબો ગયા મંગળવારની સભામાં સામેલ થયા હતા તેમની વરતણુક વીષે તે પછી વીચાર કરતાં તે વધુ અન્યથા પમાડનારી તથા અફસોસકારક થઈ લાગે છે. દેશી સરકારી અમલદારોના વરગના સંબંધમાં આટલી વાત સારીપેઠે જણીતી છે કે સરકાર સાથ સંબંધ ધરાવતી તથા સરકારી અમલદારોને પસંદ નહીં પડે એવી પ્રજા લાભની હીલચાલો જ્યારે ઉભી કરવામાં આવે છે, ત્યારે તે સાહેબો તેમનાથી દુરના દુર રહેવાની બહુ સારી સંભાળ રાખે છે. તે વીષે ખુલાસો માંગવામાં આવતાં કેટલાક સાહેબો નાચારીના દેખાવ કરી જણાવે છે કે “અમે શું કર્યો, આ ? સરકારના નોકરો પાસા, એટલે તેની સાથ સંબંધ ધરાવતાં તથા તેને પસંદ નહીં આવે એવાં કામોમાં અમારાથી ભાગ લઈ નહીં શકાય.” તે પ્રકારનો બચાવ ઉઘાડી કહાડવા અથવા છટકી જવાનાં બાહાના જેવો માત્ર કેટલીકવાર એવામાં આવે છે, અને તે લાવનારાઓની દુરદેશી વગેરે માટે તે માન લેવાનું કરતો નથી. પણ એકવાર એમ ધાર્યે કે અમલદાર વરગના

દેશીઓને સરકાર સાથે સંબંધ ધરાવતી પ્રજા તરફની હિંસ્યાઓમાં ભાગ લેવો અગવડમયું લાગે છે, તો પોતા તરફ તથા પ્રજા તરફ પોતાની દરજ્જા પ્રમાણીકપણે અદા કરવાનો રસ્તો, પ્રજાના લાભ ગેરલાભને લગતી દરેક પ્રકારની હિંસ્યાઓથી તેઓએ દુર રહેવાનોજ હોવો જોઈયે. નુકસાનકારક નીવડેલા એક હાકમની કારકીરદી સામે પ્રજામત દરશાવવાની હિંસ્યાઓથી તો તેઓ વગર કહેવે દુરજ રહે છે, ત્યારે તેવા હાકમને અધદીત રીતે વખાણવા જેવી પ્રજા લાભની વીરૂધ્ધની હિંસ્યાઓથી પણ તેઓ દુર કાં નથી રહેતા ? પ્રજા લાભની હિંસ્યાઓથી દુર રહ્યા પછી પ્રજાને નુકસાન કરે એવી હિંસ્યાલભમાં તેઓ સામેલ થાય તો, દેખીતું છે કે, ન્યાયનો તરીકા જાળવી તેઓ કામ કરતા નથી. અને તે તરીકા તોડતાં તેમને સમજવામાં આવવા જોઈયે એટલુંજ નહીં પણ ખીજી બાબતોનો વીચાર કરતાં માલમ પડશે કે પ્રજા સાથે તે વેળાએ તેમને બહુ નહારી વરતણુંક ચલાવતા પણ સમજવામાં આવવા જોઈએ. જાણીતી આ વાત છે કે સરકારી ઓધે અધીકારે ચહડેલા ધણા દેશીઓ, તે ઓધા અધીકાર મેળવવા માટે દેશી પ્રજાના અવાજ તથા ટેકાને ઓછા આભારી નથી. અમુક ચહડતા ઓધા માટે લાયક તથા તે મેળવવાનો હક ધરાવતા હોય એવા કેટલાક દેશીઓના હક ઉપર, સરકારની નજરમાં તેઓ પસંદ પડતા નહીં હોવાને લીધે અથવા ખીજા કારણસર, બ્યારે જોઈયે તેટલું ધ્યાન આપવામાં આવતું નથી, ત્યારે દેશી પ્રજાનો અવાજ તેમની હિમાયતમાં ઉઠાવવામાં આવતો વારંવાર જેવામાં આવે છે. અને પ્રજાના અવાજ ઉપર સરકારને ધ્યાન આપતું પડવાના બનાવો પણ થોડા બનેલા જોવામાં આવશે નહીં, પ્રજાના અવાજની મદદ સાથે તે રીતે સરકારી ઓધે અધીકારે ચહડેલા દેશીઓ અનેક બતાવી શકાશે ; અને તેઓને તેમજ ખીજા દેશી સરકારી અધીકારીઓને દેશી પ્રજાનો અવાજ, વળી ખીજી રીતે પણ થોડા ઉપયોગી થઈ લાગતો નથી. તેમના વડાઓ તરફથી તેમને એરંઈનસાફ થવાના, તેમના તરફ જોઈયે તેવી રીતે વરતવામાં નહીં આવવાના કે ખીજી રીતે તેઓ અગવડમાં આવી પડવાના બનાવો બ્યારે પણ બને છે, ત્યારે દેશી પ્રજાનો અવાજ લાયક અંમલદારોના બચાવમાં દરેક તરફથી ઉઠે છે, દેશી પ્રજાના અવાજનો ટેકો તે રીતે વખતે વખત મેળવતા દેશી સરકારી ઓધેદારો, સરકાર સાથે સંબંધ ધરાવતી પ્રજા લાભની હિંસ્યાઓમાં સામેલ થવાથી દુર રહેતા હોવા છતાં, ટાઉન હાલની સ્થિતિ જેવી દેશી પ્રજાના લાભ બગાડનારી ખીજી હિંસ્યાઓમાં સામેલ

થાય, ત્યારે પ્રજા તરફની તેમની તે વરતણુંકને કેવું વીશેષણ લગાડવું જોઈયે? સખત અને તેમને નહીં પસંદ આવે એવુંજ તે વીશેષણ હોવું જોઈયે; પણ તે વીચારી લેવાનું વાંચનારાઓ માટેજ અમોં રાખીશું.

લાડ હેરીસની વખાણ ગાવા માટે ઉભી કરવામાં આવેલી હીલચાલમાં ભાગ લેનારા દેશી સરકારી ઓધેદારોના સંબંધમાં તે ધોરણે વીચાર કરતાં, પ્રજાની નજરમાં તેઓ ચહ્ણતો દેખાવ કરતા જણાશે નહીં. પ્રજાને સાદો ઇનસાફ અપાવવા જેવી હીલચાલમાં ભાગ લેવાની હીંમત ધરાવતા પણ તેઓ જ્યારે જણાતા નથી, અને તે છતાં પ્રજાના લાભ બગાડવા જેવી એક હીલચાલમાં તેઓ માંહેલા ધણાઓ સામેલ થયા છે, ત્યારે તેમના સંબંધમાં કેવાં અનુમાન થવા લાગવાં જોઈયે? હાકમને રાજી કરવા અથવા પોતાના તરફ ખતાવવામાં આવેલી મેહેરખાનીઓ માટે તેનો આભાર વાળવાની નેમથી તેઓ તેની વખાણ ગાવા નીકળ્યા છે, એવું અનુમાન થવાનો સંભવ શું તે ઉપરથી રહેવો નહીં જોઈયે? અમોને બધા લાગે છે કે ટાઉન હાલની સભામાં બોલનારા તેમજ મુંગે મોહોડે તેમાં ભાગ લેનારા કેટલાક દેશી અધીકારીઓને પોતાની સામે પ્રજા વચ્ચે ધણી તરફ બહુ નાપસંદ અનુમાન કરવામાં આવતું તથા તે ખુલ્લી રીતે દરશાવવામાં આવતું સાંભળવું પડશે.

તા. ૨ જા કેબરવારી સને ૧૮૯૫.



JAM-E-JAMSHED.

૧

વીદાય થતા ગવરનર નામદાર લારડ હેરીસની
યાદગારી રાખવા બાહર પડેલાઓને
એક “ ખુદલો પત્ર.”

~~~~~

મારા દુહા મીત્રો,

તમે ભાઈઓ ખરેખરા દુહા છો. કે નહી, તે તો મોટી મોટી વાતો કરવા પછી તમોએ ઉભાં કરેલાં તથા કરવા ધારેલાં યાદગારીનાં ફૂડામાં કેવી દુહી રકમો તમે ભરી આપોછો તે ઉપરથી વધારે ખુદી રીતે જણાઇ આવશે, પણ આ પત્રની શરૂઆતમાંજ તમારું ધ્યાન ખેંચવું જોઈએ કે આગલા પાછલા વખતનો વીચાર કરી કાંઈ પણ પગલું ભરવું જોઈએ છે, પગલું એવું ભરવું જોઈએ છે કે જે માટે પાછળથી પસ્તાવો કરવો પડે નહીં. હાલના હાકેમ સાહેબ નામદાર લારડ હેરીસની કારકીરદીનો પ્રજા પુરતો સવાદ ચાખી ચુકી છે, જેથી તે વીશે કાંઈ વધુ બોલી એ નામદારના તમે વખાણનારાઓએ કસેલી કમર હું ધીલી કરવા માગતો નથી. પણ તમે જો એ નામદારની કહેવાતી “ અતી લાભકારક, ફતેહમંદ કારકીરદી ” ઉપર જણાવો છો તેવા શીદા થઇ ગયા હો, તો તમારી એ શીદાગીરીનો ઉભરો નામદાર લારડ હેરીસ સાહેબની વીદાયગીરી પછી બાહર પાડવો જોઈએ છે, કે જેમાંજ શીદાગીરીની ખરી કશોટી સમાયલી છે. તમે એ નામદારની ફતેહમંદ હાકમાઇથી જયારે બહુ ખુશ ખુશ થઈ ગયાછો, ત્યારે છ અઠવાડયાંની ઢીલ કરવામાં કાંઈ ખોવાતું નથી. એવી ઢીલ કરવાથી જે લાભ થવાની આશા રહે છે, તે તમે વીસરી ગયલા લાગો છો. નામદાર લારડ હેરીસ સાહેબ બેલમંટના પોતાના મહેલમાં નવા જુના થવા પછી તમે સાહેબો એ નામદારની યાદગારી જાળવવાને ભેગા મળશો, તમારી ચેલ્લીનાં મોઢાં ખુલાં મેલી દઇ હજારો કે લખો રૂપીઆ ભેગા કરી દેશો, તો નવા હાકેમ સાહેબની જાણમાં પણ વધારે આવશે કે, તેવજુની હાકમાઇવાળાં શેહેરમાં કેવાં કેવાં હેશાનમંદ માનવીઓ વસે છે.

પણુ ભાઈઓ, હાલની તમારી દોડાદોડી અમો દુર બેઠેલાઓને કેટલીક રમુજ આપે છે, નામદાર હાકેમ સાહેબને પોતાને પણુ મન સાથે બળાપો કરવાની ફરજ પાડતી હશે કે, “ મને મારા ‘વખાણુનારાઓ’થી બચાવો ” ! પ્રભને નામની હીલચાલ કરવા માટે એક સભા હજી તો આવતા મંગળવારે મળનાર છે, તેટલામાં ખાન બાહાદુર મરજખાનસાહેબનાં મકાનમાં નામદાર હાકેમ સાહેબે અંગબળની કસરતોને ખીલવવા માટે જે “ તારી-શલાયક દીલસોજી ” બતાવી હતી, તેની યાદગારી કાયમ રાખવાને તમે કેટલાક સાહેબો ભેગા મળ્યા હતા. અંગબળની કસરતોના સંબંધમાં કોઈ દીવસે પણુ જેઓનાં નામે સાંભળેલાં નહીં, જેઓ અંગબળની કસરતોના મેળાવડાઓમાં હાજર થયલા નહી, તેઓને નામદાર લારડ હેરીસ સાહેબની પીછાન કરવા માટે આટલા બધા તલપી રહેલા જોઈ મારા સ્વદેશી ભાઈઓ માટે મને વીચાર બેસી ગયો હતો કે, હવે મારા દેશી ભાઈઓનું દલદર શીટ ખરું ! બહુ ઇતેજારીથી મેં બીજે દીવસનાં વરતમાનપતરો વાંચ્યાં, કે એ હરખાઈ ગયલા હેશાનમંદ સાહેબોએ નામદાર લારડ હેરીસના અંગબળની કસરતોનાં ઉતેજનની કંઈ કંઈ વીગતો પ્રભની જાણુ માટે બાહર પાડી હતી, કે જે વાંચવાથી કદાચ મારી ઉપર પણુ અસર થાય, તો હું પણુ એ હીલચાલમાં સામેલ થઈ જાઉં. પણુ તેવું તો મારા વાંચવામાં આવ્યુંજ નહી- સભામાં બોલાયુ કે એ નામદારે ઘણું કર્યું છે અને સભાએ તે તુરત સ્વીકારી દીધું. પણુ મારા જેવા અજ્ઞાન બટની તેથી ખાતરી શી થાય ! તેટલા માટે મારો અનુભવ જો હું રજુ કરું તો મને બેઅદબ ગણુશો મા. નામદાર ગનરનર સાહેબ લારડ હેરીસ બા મુખ્ય ધલાકાનો રાજકારોમાર ચલાવવા માટે આવ્યા હતા, જેની રૂએ તેવણુની અનેક ફરજોમાંની એ પણુ એક ફરજ હતી કે, તન તથા મનની કેળવણીને સારા ધોરણ ઉપર ખીલવવી. નામદાર લારડ હેરીસ સાહેબ એક અચછા શોખીન ક્રીકેટર છે અને જોકે નાઇઝ નદી આગળથી પસાર થતાં તેવણે જાહેર કર્યું હતું કે “ મારી ક્રીકેટની પોઠી બંધ થઈ છે, ” પણુ તમે ભાઈઓનું ખાન મેળવવાનું એ નામદારની સરજતમાં હશે, જેથી ક્રીકેટનો શોખ પોતાની હાકખાઈદરમયાન પુરતો પાર પાડે છે. એ નામદાર અનેક મેચો રમ્યા છે, કેટલીક મેચોમાં અમ્મણ દીવસની હાજરી આપવાની મેહેરબાની કરી ગયા છે, પણુ એ નામદાર ઇંગ્લેન્ડ દીમે સાથે જોડલી સ્લેય રમી છે, તેનો એક નાનો ભાગ પણુ દેશીઓ સાથે રમ્યા હોય એવું આપણે સાંભળ્યું નથી. એ નામદાર

પુના જીમખાના, મુંબઈ જીમખાના ઈંગ્લેન્ડની કીલ્ડીયન એસોસીએશન કલબ, રેજીમેન્ટલ ટીમો વગેરે સાથ મેચો રમ્યા છે, પણ પારસી જીમખાના, હીંદુ જીમખાના, ઇસલામ જીમખાના, એલ્ફીનસ્ટન ક્રીકેટ કલબ વગેરે જેવી આગેવાન દેશી કલબો સાથ મેચ રમ્યા હોય એવું હજી જણાયું નથી. આ હીલ્સવાલના પીતા મી. જમશેદજી પટેલ નામના જવાન પારસી શૈઠના ટીમ સાથજ એ નામદાર ત્રણ મેચ રમ્યા છે, અને તે ત્રણે ટીમ મીશ્ર ટીમ હતા, જેનો સખબ શો હોય, તે હું જાણતો નથી. એ નામદારને અરજ થઈ હતી કે મુંબઈના ક્રીકેટરોને ખેલવા માટે એકજ સાઈ રમતનું મેદાન છે, જે મેદાનમાં આશરે ડઝન પોસ્ટો રમનારાઓ અઠવાડયામાં બે વાર પોતાની રમત રમી મેદાનને ક્રીકેટ માટે ધાસતી-અરયું વટીક બનાવી દે છે, તેમાંથી ક્રીકેટરોના છુટકો કરવાની કૃપા કરો. પણ ક્રીકેટરોની એ ખાએસ હજી પાર પડી નથી. એ નામદારે પોતાનાં કેટલાંક બાપણોમાં એક કરતાં વધુ વાર સુચના કરી હતી કે, રકુલો અને કાલેજોનાં મકાનોની આસપાસ રમતોનાં ખુલ્લાં યોગાનોની સગવડ હોવી જોઈએ, પણ સધળી શાળાઓ માટેનાં આ એકાદ મેદાનની પણ સેકંડો ક્રીકેટરોને પુરતી સગવડ મળી શકતી નથી. સરકારી એલ્ફીનસ્ટન કાલેજના પ્રીનસીપલને ગયા નવેમ્બર માસમાં ફરીઆદ કરતાં આપણે સાંભળ્યા હતા કે, એ કાલેજમાંની કહાડી નાખેલી કસરતશાળા હાલનાં મકાનમાં પાછી સથાપવા માટે સેક્રેટરીના રેકરડો થકી અલાયદા કહાડેલા ઓરડાઓમાંથી એક ઓરડો આપવો; પણ તે સગવડ ઇલાકાની એ વડી કાલેજને હજી મળી શકી નથી. પુનાની દખણ કાલેજના પ્રીનસીપલ સાહેબે નામદાર લારડ હેરીસની સરકારનું એવી મતલબનું ધ્યાન ખેંચ્યું હતું કે, “મારા ચેલાઓ અંગ્રજીની કસરતો માટે તેઓની મરીબ હાલત તરફ નીગાહ કરતાં બહુ સારો હીસો આપે છે અને જોકે તેઓ કસરતો કરી આંગ ખીલવવાને પુરતા ખાએસમંદ છે, પણ માળાપોલી જેમણ્ણી ગરીબ સંથીતીને લીધે કાલેજમાં અંગ્રજીની કસરતોની ખીલવણી માટે વધુ બની શકતું નથી, માટે હમણાં સરઆતના ખર્ચ ચઢી રૂ. ૭,૦૦૦ તથા આણું નીભાવના ખર્ચ માટે રૂ. ૧૫,૦૦૦ ની રકમની મંજૂરવાત આપો.” એ ખાએસ ગાંધ પડી નથી. ગયા નવેમ્બર માસમાં અદાર પટેલા એક સરકારી ડરાવ ઉપરથી જણાયું હતું કે, અંગ્રજીની કસરતોને ઉત્તેજન આપવા પાછલ મુંબઈ સરકાર તરફથી ચતો ખાસીકિ ખર્ચ થોડાક હમરની રકમનો છે, જ્યારે ઈલાકાની હાલત તેથી બહુ



મોટી છે, જે હાજત નામદાર લારડ હેરીસ સાહેબ જે ચાહતે તો હાર પાડી શકતે. આટલું છતાં જે ગયા સોમવારની સભામાં ભેગા મળેલા સાહેબોએ એ નામદારે કસરતોને આપેલાં ખાસ ઉત્તેજનોની વીગતો બહાર પાડી હતે તો આપણા જ્ઞાનમાં વધારો થતો. પણ એ સાહેબોએ તો તે વીશે ચુપ-કીદીજ પકડેલી જણાય છે. આગલા હાકેમોએ અંગબળની કસરતોની ખીલવણી માટે કાંઈ કર્યુંજ ન હતું, એમ તો કહેવાશે નહીં. નામદાર સર જેમસ ફરગ્યુસને મુખર્જીની વાલંટીયર કોરમાં કરનલનો ઓધો લેવાને એટલા માટે ના પાડેલું કહેવાયું હતું કે, તે કોરમાં દેશીઓને સામેલ કરવા ન હતા. એજ ગવરનર સાહેબ મોંમે હંટ કલબમાં સામેલ થયા હતા, તે એવું નકી થવા પછી કે એ હંટ કલબમાં દેશીઓને પણ દાખલ કરવામાં આવશે. હું લુલ્હતો નહીં હોવું તો કીકેટના મેદાનમાથી પોલોની રમત એ માજી ગવરનર સાહેબનાજ અમલમાં કેટલોક વખત બંધ પાડવામાં આવી હતી. ઉપલી વીગતો હું સાંભળવા ઉપરથી આપું છું, જે જે ખરી હોય તો તે બતાવી આપે છે કે દેશીઓનાં અંગને વધારે ખીલવવા માટે સર જેમસ ફરગ્યુસને કાંઈ જેવો તેવો અગતનો હીસો આપેલો ગણાય નહીં. પણ તે નામદારની ખાસ યાદગારી અંગબળની કસરતો માટે કેણે રાખી હતી ?

પણ ભાઈઓ, ગયા સોમવારે જે સભા ખાનબાહાદુર મનચેરજી મર-ઝખાનના મકાનમાં યોલાવવામાં આવી હતી, તેમાં અંગબળની કસરતોમાં ભાગ લેનારા કેટલા સાહેબો હાજર હતા ? જે પારસી કીકેટ ઈલેવન મોટી મેચો રમે છે, જે મેચો નામદાર લારડ હેરીસ સાહેબની મેહેરબાનીથી ઝોઠવાય છે એવું જણાવવામાં આવે છે, અને જે ઉપરથી આ હીલચાલને જનમ મળેલો કહેવાય છે, તે પારસી કીકેટ ઈલેવનનો એક પણ રમનાર એ સભામાં હાજર થયો હોય, એવું વરતમાનપતરોમાં પ્રગટ થયેલાં નામો ઉપરથી જણાતું નથી. હીંદુ તથા ઇસલામ ઈલેવનના રમનારાઓમાંથી અરધી ડગ્ગનનો ત્રીજો ભાગ પણ હાજર થયા હોય, એવું એ હાજર રહેલાઓની ટીપ ઉપરથી હું જોઈ શકતો નથી, ત્યારે આ હીલચાલ કેણની ગણાય ? શું તમે ઉલટમંદ ભાઈઓ “હેમલેટ” નો ખેલ “હેમલેટ” વગર ભજી બતાવવા માગો છો ? શું આ હીલચાલ ખુદ “સ-પોરટસમેનો” ને બાતલ રાખી સપોરટસમેનોના વખાણનારાઓ મારફતેજ હાજર પાડવા કારી છે કે ? નામદાર લારડ હેરીસે દેશી કીકેટરોને ખાસ ઉત્તેજન આપ્યું હોય, તો તે કીકેટરોની ફરજ છે કે એ નામદારને મેજબાની આપવી, મા તેવણની યાદગારી કાયમ રાખવાને ગમે એવાં

પગલાં ભરવાં. પણ જેમ ગયા સોમવારે થયું હતું તેમ મોટું જાહેર રૂમ ખીન્નઓએ આપવાની ભુલ કરવી જોઈતી નથી. મને ખાતરીજ છે કે નામદાર લારડ હેરીસ જેવા એક મોટા “ સપોરટસમેન ” પણ મારા આવીચાર સાથે એકમત થવા વગર રહેશે નહીં. જો કોઈએ પણ અંબખાની કસરતોની ખીલવણી માટે મેજખાની આપવી હોય, તો તે મુબઈ જીમખાના, પારસી જીમખાના, ઇસલામ જીમખાના તથા હીંદુ જીમખાનાઓએ સાથે મળીને પોતા તરફની એક મેજખાની આપવી જોઈએ છે. નહીં કે મીઠ જમશેદજી પટેલ અને તેવણના થોડાક મળતા વીરોડાએ પ્રગળે નામે આપવી જોઈએ.

મારા દુહા ભાઈઓ, મેં ઉપર જણાવ્યું છે કે તમે ભાઈઓ નામદાર લારડ હેરીસને કદાચ બળાપો કરવાની દરજ્જા પાડો છો કે “ મને મારા એવા વખાણનારાઓથી બચાવો ” અને તેનો સબબ પણ દેખાઈતો છે. ગયા સોમવારની સભામાં એવું નહીં થયું વરતમાનપત્રોમાં જાહેર થયું છે કે, જે ૧૩ ઉભું કરવામાં આવ્યું હતું, તેમાંથી એ નામદારને એક મેજખાની આપવામાં આવશે અને બાકી શબ્દ પડનારી રકમમાંથી એ નામદારનાં નામનું એક “ શીલ્ડ ” સ્થાપવામાં આવશે એવો ઠરાવ કરી ઉઠનારાઓને ખબર ન હશે કે ક્રીકેટની રમતમાં સરસ નીવડનારાઓને “ કપ ” યા “ શીલ્ડ ” યા ખીન્ન કોઈબી ઇનામ આપવાની સામે નામદાર લારડ હેરીસ અણગમો ધરાવે છે. મુબઈની હાઇ સ્કુલો વચ્ચે છેલ્લાં બે વરસ થયાં જે હરીફાઈની મેચો રમાય છે, તેમાં ફોર્મલ નીવડનારી હાઇ સ્કુલને “ કપ ” યા “ શીલ્ડ ” મેળવવાને વાજબી હક છે, જેમ મધરાસ તથા કલકત્તામાં બનતું આવે છે, પણ આપણી એથલેટીક આસોસીએશન આપણી ફોર્મલ હાઇ સ્કુલને શીલ્ડ યા કપ આપતી નથી, તે કદાચ નામદાર લારડ હેરીસ સાહેબની ઉપલી લાગણીને લીધે હોય એ બનવાજોગ છે. મારી એ ખબર જો ખરી હોય, તો એવું હો કે, નામદાર લારડ હેરીસ જેવા એક સુનંદ ક્રીકેટર ક્રીકેટની રમતમાં ઇનામ આપવાની સખત વીરુધ્ધ હોવા છતાં, તેવણની યાદગારી તેવાં ઇનામથીજ રાખવાને મીઠ જમશેદજી પટેલની કંપની ઠરાવ કરી ઉઠી છે ! નામદાર લારડ હેરીસ સાહેબની યાદગારી મુબઈમાં તેવણની લાગણીની વીરુધ્ધનાં કામથીજ ભારે “ ગુલેસતાન ” માં ભેગા મળેલા સાહેબો રાખવા માગે છે કે ?

પણ એવી “ સપોરટીંગ યાદગારીની હીલચાલ ” નો મને તો કાંઈક અનુભવ મળી ચુકે છે. બે વરસની વાત ઉપર મરહુમ શેઠ સોરાબજી

સાપુરજી બંગાલીની યાદગારી કાયમ રાખવાને કીકિટરે તથા અંગબળની કસરતોના “વખાણુનારાઓ” ની એક મોટી સભા એક સાંજના મીઠા જમશેદજી પટેલના પ્રમુખપણાં હેઠળ નોવેલ્ટી થીયેટરમાં મળી હતી. મીઠા પટેલ, મીઠા ઇમરાહીમ રહીમતુલ્લા વગેરેએ તે સભામાં ભાષણો કર્યાં હતાં, એક ફંડ ઉભું કરવાનો ઠરાવ પસાર થયો હતો, એક કમીટી નેમાઈ હતી, પણ પછી ! કાંઈ થયલું જ નહોતું નથી.

પણ સાહેબો, ઉપલાં ઉતાવળયાં પગલાંમાંથી તમે બહાર નીકળી શક્યા નથી, તેટલામાં એક બીજાં કામમાં તમારી મદદની વકી રખાય છે. આવતા મંગળવારે મીઠા એચ. એ. એકવરથ અને ધારાસભાના બે ઑનરેબલ સભાસદો વગેરે તરફથી એક સભા મયુનીસીપલ હાલમાં હાકેમ સાહેબની જાહેર યાદગારી કાયમ રાખવાની બાબદ ઉપર તકરાર ચલાવવા તથા સેવટ ઉપર આવવા માટે બોલાવવામાં આવી છે. એ સભામાં હું પોતે હાજર થઈ શકું કે નહીં, તે માટે હું ગુચવણમાં પડ્યો છું. મને નોતર તો દેવામાં આવ્યું નથી, પણ જે આ જાહેર હિલચાલ હોય તો તેમાં હાજર થવાનો મને તેમજ મારા એકેએક વાંચનારને સરખોજ હક છે, મીઠા એકવરથ, ઑનરેબલ મીઠા બોહરટ, ઑનરેબલ મીઠા નવરોજજી વહાડયા જેટલોજ હક ગણાવો જોઈએ, એમ હું માનું છું. વહી નોત્રાંની ચીઠીમાં ખુલ્લા બોલોમાં જણાવ્યું છે કે “મયુનીસીપલ હોલ” માં એ સભા બોલાવી છે જેથી એ સભાને જાહેર રૂપ સીધી નહીં તો આડકતરી રીતે અપાઈ ચુકું છે. “મયુનીસીપલ હોલ” માં જે સભા મળે તે પ્રજા લાગણીની વીરૂધ્ધનાં કામ માટે તો હોયજ નહીં અને પ્રજા લાગણીની વીરૂધ્ધનાં કામ માટે જો “મયુનીસીપલ હોલ” માં સભા બોલાવવામાં આવે, તો તે માટે જોખમદાર કોણ ? મયુનીસીપલ કમીશનર યા મયુનીપલ કાર્પોરેશન ? આવતા મંગળવારની સભા એવા અનેક સવાલો આગમજથી ઉભા કરાવે છે, જે સવાલોનો એ સભાનું કામ શરૂ થાય તે અગાઉ નક્કી ફંડો કરવામાં આવે તો ઠીક કે તમે ભાઈઓનાં એકદીલી ભરયાં કામમાં નાહકનો કટકો પડે નહીં. પ્રજાની તીજેરીમાંથી રૂ ૧૫ લાખને ખરચે પ્રજાની આ ઈમારત બંધાઈ છે, જેનાં દીવાનખાનામાં સભાઓ મેળવવાનું મયુનીસીપલ કમીશનરની એકલાનીજ ખરજ ઉપર રહે, એ પણ “સચાનીક સ્વરાજ” નો એક જાણુવા જોગ સંકેત છે.

તા. ૧૨ મી જાન્યુઆરી સને ૧૯૫૫.

હું છું, તમારો સેવક,

શાંત બાણી બા.

## નામદાર લારડ હેરીસની યાદગારી જલવવાને મળેલી તથા મલનારી સભા.



મુ'બઇના વીદાય થતા ગવરનર નામદાર લારડ હેરીસની યાદગારી કાયમ રાખવાની શરૂઆતમાં બોલાતી હીલચાલે વધારે ડાહપણુબરયા ધો-રણુનું રૂપ પકડેલું જોઇ સંતોશ ઉપજે છે. પ્રજાને નામે શેરીફની મારફતે આ અણુગમતા નીવડેલા ગવરનર સાહેબની યાદગારી કાયમ રાખવાની થોડાક સાહેબો તરફથી હીલચાલ થવાની વાતો જાહેર પડી હતી, તે સામે રજુ થયેલી મજબુત પ્રજા લાગણી—અલખતાં દેશી પ્રજા લાગણી—ને માન આપી લાગતાવળગતાઓએ એ હીલચાલને “પ્રજાની હીલચાલ”નું નામ આપવાની ખાએસ તજ દીધી છે, તે માટે તેઓને અમે મુખારકબાદી આપ્યે છીએ, કારણકે એવું વાજબી પગલું ભરી એ સાહેબોએ નામદાર લારડ હેરીસની પોતાની પણ એક જાતની સેવા બજાવી છે, તેવણુને નાહકના વધુ અણુગમતામાંથી મોકળા રાખ્યા છે. “ચુનીસીપલ હોલ”માં શરૂઆતની સભા બોલાવવાની છેલ્લી કસોટી અજમાવી જોવામાં આવી હતી જાણે પ્રજા લાગણીની વધારે ખુદી તપાસ લેવામાં આવી હતી, અને પ્રજા લાગણી તુરતજ જાહેર પડતાં, કેટલાક જાણીતા શેહેરીસમાજ-ઓનાં ખરાં નામનો લખીત પ્રોટેસ્ટ રજુ થતાં, તુરતજ આગેવાન મહસ્યોએ એ સભા ચુનીસીપલ હોલમાં મેળવવાનો વીચાર માડી વાળ્યો એટલુંજ નહીં, પણ આગમજથી સંભાળ લઇ એ હીલચાલને “નામદાર લારડ હેરીસના મીત્રો તથા વખાણુનારાઓની હીલચાલ”નું નામ આપ્યું છે, જે માટે અમે પાછો સંતોશ બતાવવા માગ્યે છીએ. સભાના પ્રમુખે સભાનું કામ શરૂ થતાંજ જણાવી દીધું હતું કે, “એ હીલચાલ નામદાર લારડ હેરીસના મીત્રો તથા વખાણુનારાઓની છે” અને સભામાં જે પેહેલો દરાવ એકમતે પસાર થયો હતો, તેમાં પણ તેઓએ વાજબી રીતે જણાવ્યું છે કે “લારડ હેરીસના મીત્રો તથા વખાણુનારાઓની એક સભા ટાઉન હોલમાં મંગળવાર તા. ૨૬ મી જાનેવારીને દીને સાંજના પાંચ કલાકે બોલાવવી.”

“નામદાર લારડ હેરીસના મીત્રો તથા વખાણુનારાઓ”ને એ નામ

દારની યાદગારી પોતાની મરજીમાં આવે તેવાં કામથી રાખવાનો દરેક હક છે, જેની આડે આવવાને કોઈપણ બાહર પડનાર નથી. પ્રજા ઉલટો સંતોશ લેશે કે દેશી કહેવત મુજબ “માહું ડુધામ લે સારાને કાળે” તેમ પ્રજાને બહુ નીરાશી આપેલા અમલ પછી પ્રજાને થોડોક સંતોશ આપનાર એક જાહેર ખાતું એ નામદારની વીદાયગીરી પછી, મહેલી નીરાશીનો કાંઈક બદલો આપવા માટે, તેવણના “મીત્રો અને વખાણુ-વારાઓ”એ મુબઈ ઈલાકાની પ્રજાને ભેટ આપવાની જરૂર જોઈ છે. પણ એવો સંતોશ કોઈ ઉપયોગી ખાતું અમલમાં આવવાથીજ મળી શકશે અને નહીં કે પથરનાં બાવલાંથી “બસંટોમેનયા” સામેની સમજી પ્રજાની લાગણી સઘળે ઠેકાણે બાહર પડી ચુકી છે, પ્રજાને ઉપયોગી થઈ પડેલા સઘળાજ નરોનાં બાવલાંઓ સમજી પ્રજા ઉભી કરતી નથી અને સમજી પ્રજાએ પોતાની લાગણી આખી દુન્યામાં બાહર પાડી છે કે, બાવલાંઓ ઉપયોગી નરોની હાઈયાતી ખતમ થવા પછી ઉભાં કરેલાં વધારે વાજખી ગણાય. નામદાર ગવરનર લારડ હેરીસના “મીત્રો તથા વખાણુવારાઓ” ૩ ૨૫૦૨૩ ની સારી રકમ આખા ઇલાકામાંથી મેળવી શક્યા છે, આખા ઇલાકાના રાજપતીઓની મદદની કુમક સાથે મેળવી શક્યા છે. આપણે તેઓને વધુ ફતેહ ઇચ્છી ઉમેદ રાખ્યે છીએ કે, એક વધારે મોટી રકમ ભેગી કરી એ બાધઓ ઇલાકાને તેમાંથી કાંઈક ફાયદો આપે. તા. ૨૯ મી જાન્યુઆરીની સાંજના “નામદાર લારડ હેરીસના મીત્રો તથા વખાણુવારાઓ” એ નામદારની યાદગારી કેવી રીતે જળવવા માગે છે તે આપણે અત્યારથીજ અટકળ કરી શકતા નથી, પણ આપણે આગમજથી સુચના તો કરી શક્યે કે, છેલ્લાં પાંચ વરસના અમલે આ ઈલાકાની રાજદવારી તવારીખ કેટલીક પછાત કરી નાખી છે, તેમ એ નામદારની યાદગારી પણ પથરના બાવલાં મારણે રાખી એ રકમ ખીનઉપયોગી તરીકે નાખી દઈ, એ નામદારના અમલને વધારે નફામો કરી આપવાની જુલ કરવી નહીં, પરંતુ એ નામદારનું બાવલું ઉજી ચયાથી આપણે કાંઈ નીરાશ થઈ જવાના નથી, કારણ કે “મીત્રો તથા વખાણુવારાઓ” ને પોતાનાં નાણાંને ઉપયોગ પોતાની મરજી મુજબ કરવાનો દરેક હક છે. સેવટે એટલું અમો જણાવી શક્યે કે, નામદાર લારડ હેરીસના મીત્રો તથા વખાણુવારાઓએ પોતાની આવી પીછાનયત શક્તિ અતાવવા માટે આટલી બધી ઉતાવળ કરી દેવી જોઈતી ન હતી. નામદાર લારડ હેરીસની ગવરનર તરીકેની કારકીરદીથી એ સાહેબો આ-

ટલા બધા શીદ થઇ ગયલા જણાય છે, તો એ નામદારની વીદાયગીરી જેર થોભવામાં કાંઈ ખોવાનું ન હતું. કદાચ શીદાગીરી ઠંડી પડી જવાની કેટલાકોએ વકી રાખી હોય, પણ પ્રજાની મોટા ભાગની વીરધતા છતાં જે મીત્રો અને વખાણુનારાઓ બહુ શીદ થયા હોય, તે શીદાગીરી ટુંક વખતની તો હોયજ નહીં. નામદાર લારડ હેરીસ હીંદુસતાનનો કીનારો છોડી જવા પછી મીં એચ. એ. એકવરચનાં પ્રમુખપણું હેઠલ ભેગા મળેલા સાહેબોએ જો એ નામદારની યાદગારી જળવવા માટે સભા મેળવી હતે, તેજ સભામાં ફંડમાં નાણું ભરાવવાની શરૂઆત કરી હતે, તો પછી એવા પ્રકારની યાદગારીની હીલચાલ માટે કાંઈ સવાલ રહેતેજ નહીં. એ નામદાર તરફની શીદાગીરીનો સંગીન ખયાલ એ સાહેબોએ આપણુ પ્રજાને તેમજ નામદાર લારડ હેરીસને પણ આપયો હતે.

તાં ૧૭ મી જાનેવારી સને ૧૮૯૫.

### ૩

મુંબઈના ગવરનરની છેલ્લી મુલાકાત વખતે ભરૂચ  
મયુનીસીપાલીટીએ ખરચેલા રૂ ૩૦૦  
સામે નવો વાંધો.

( અમારા ખચરપત્રી તરફથી )

મુંબઈના નામદાર ગવરનર લારડ હેરીસ ભરૂચ શહેરની મુલાકાતે ગયા નવેમ્બર માસમાં આવેલા, તે વખતે અતરેની મયુનીસીપાલીટીએ એ નામદારને આવકાર દેવા માટે રૂ ૩૦૦ ખરચ્યા હતા, જે ખરચ કરતાં અટકાવવા માટે એક કર ભરનાર મીં દાઉદભાઈએ દીવાની કોરટમાં દાવેદ બાંધયો હતો, અને પાછળથી પોતાની કામના આગ્રહને લીધે પાછો ખેંચી લીધો હતો. એજ મુસલમાન વેપારીએ પોસ્ટ કારડ ઉપર છપાવેલી નીચલી નોટીસ મયુનીસીપાલીટીના દરેક મેમ્બરો ઉપર હાલ મોકલી છે:—

નોટીસ.

“ હું નીચે સહી કરનાર આ લેખ ઉપરથી ખચર આપું છું કે હું ભરૂચ શહેરનો વતની છું અને મયુનીસીપાલીટીની હદમાં મારી કેટલીક

સથાવર મીલકત છે અને મયુનીસીપાલિટીનો રેટપેયર છું. જ્યારે મુંબઈના મવરનર લારડ હેરીસ બંદ્ય પધારયા હતા, ત્યારે તેમને માનપત્ર તથા આવકાર આપવામાં મયુનીસીપલ ફંડમાંથી તમે રૂ ૩૦૦ નો ખર્ચ કર્યો છે અને તે ગેરકાયદેસર છે. એ ખર્ચને માટે હું તમને જવાબદાર ગણું છું અને તેટલા માટે એ નાણાં મયુનીસીપલ ફંડમાં પાછાં મુકાવવા સાથે કાયદાસર ક્લાજ લેવાનો મારો વીચાર છે. તેની આ નોટીસ ઉપરથી હું સુચના આપું છું, જોકે કાયદા પ્રમાણે તમને નોટીસ આપવાની હું બંદર ધારતો નથી.”

બંદ્ય, તા. ૨૩ મી જાન્યુઆરી ૧૮૮૫.

૪

## પારસીઓ અને નામદાર લારડ હેરીસની યાદગારીનું ફંડ.

નામદાર મવરનર લારડ હેરીસની યાદગારી કાયમ રાખવાને ઉભાં થયલાં ફંડ માટે સખ્ત નાપસંદગી બતાવનારી એક આરટીકલ લખતાં, અમદાવાદનું “હિતેચ્છુ” પત્ર ટીકા કરે છે કે, “મુંબઈ ક્લાકમાંના ઉમર લાયકના ૩૦૦૦૦ પારસીઓમાંથી ૬૯ પારસીઓએ આ ફંડમાં રકમો ભરી છે, તે જોતાં તેમનું પ્રમાણ દશ હજારે ૨૩ નું આવે છે અને હિંદુઓનું લગભગ દર બે લાખે ૧ નું પ્રમાણ આવે છે અને મુસલમાનોનું દર ૧૦ લાખે એકનું પ્રમાણ આવે છે. આપરથી વાંચનારી આલમ એમ અનુમાન કરે કે, પારસી ભાષાઓમાં ખુશામત ઘણી વધી છે અને તેથી તેઓ લાયક નાલાયકની પીછાંન કરવામાં ઘણા પછાત પડે છે, તેા તેમનું તે ધારવું અને માનવું ખોટું પાડવું અમને ઘણું અશક્ય લાગે છે. પારસી ટોક્ષો પોતાને સવતંત્રપણે વરતનારો અને સ્વતંત્ર તરીકે ઓળખાવનારો ઘણી વખતે જણાવી અભીમાન લે છે, તેજ વરગના આમ બીજી દેશી કામો સાથે સરખાવતાં ખુશામતમાં આગળ વધે, એથી તેમને માટે બીજી પ્રજા કેવું સમજે એ વીચારવાનું અમે એ કામના વીદ-વનોએ સોંપીશું.”

તા. ૨૬ મી જાન્યુઆરી ૧૮૮૫.

## નામદાર લારડ હેરીસની યાદગારી કાયમ રાખ- વાની ઉલટમંદ હીલચાલો.

જામે જમશેદના અધીપતી જોગ—

સાહેબ,

લારડ હેરીસનાં ૪૩માં નાણાં ભરનારાઓનું પ્રમાણ શું છે અને રૂપિયા ૨૫૦૦૦ કોણની થેલીમાંથી જમાવ થયા છે, તે તો જાણીતી ખીના છે અને મુજહેમત વ્યર્થ છે. “વખાણનારાઓ અને દોસતો” બહુ ઉલટમાં એકદમ આવી ગયા છે. “લારડ હેરીસે ક્રીકેટની કસરતને ઉતેજન આપ્યું” માટે ૪૩માં નાણાં ભરવાની સીધારસો શાળાઓમાં થવા લાગી છે. “નેશનલ આસોસીએશન” માંથી જુદું ૪૩ લારડ અને બેડી હેરીસને મેમોરીયલ આપવા ફરતું થયલું કહેવાય છે. પારસી જીમખાનામાં એક ફેરો ખાવો તો એ નામદારના કેટલાક વખાણનારાઓની તેમની યાદગારી જળવવાનાં ૪૩માં નાણાં ભરવાની સીધારસો સાંભળી તમે અચરત થાવો. સાચું થયું—અરે હીંદુનું નસીબજ ફરી ગયું—કે, નામદાર લારડ હેરીસ જેવો રાજકરતા પોતાનાં મુખારક કદમ હીંદના કીનારાપર લાવયા, નહીં તો આજે હીંદીવાનો દુરબળ જેવા દુઃખમાં પીડાતા આયલાઓ રહેતે ને મરદાનગી જેવું સવપને પણ જોતે નહીં. જય, જય, હીંદની જય! હજી તો શેહેરી બાવાઓની વોટની માંગણીઓ ખલાસ નથી થઈ, તેટલાં યાદગારી, જીયાંશત ફતેહમંદ બનાવવાની દોડદોડી ચાલી રહી છે, એ ઉપરથી સાર શું ખેંચી કાઢવો, તે વાંચનાર ઉપરજ મોંપું છું.

મુબરક, તા. ૨૬ મી જાનેવારી ૧૮૯૫.

લા. Veritas.

(૨)

જામે જમશેદના અધીપતી જોગ—

સાહેબ,

નામદાર ગવરનર લારડ હેરીસની યાદગારી, અંગબળ તથા એક્સ ક્રીકેટના સંબંધમાં. ઉતેજન આપવા કીજે, કાયમ. રાખવા માટેની



હીલચાલ બહુ દીવસ થયા ચાલુ થઈ છે અને આપણુ અત્યાર લગણુ જાણવા માટે થોભી રહ્યા કે, ક્રીકેટ સંબંધી તે નામદારનું શું યાદ રાખવા લાયક કામ છે, જે તેવણના વખાણનારાઓ ખતાવી શકે, પણ આપણે જોઈ લીધું છે કે તેઓ તેવું હજી ખતાવા બાહેર પડ્યા નથી. હું વગર આંચકાએ કહી શકું કે ક્રીકેટને માટે લારડ હેરીસે કાંઈ અસાધારણુ યા જીવ જેવું કર્યું નથી. એક જવાન અહસથ, જેવણુ ક્રીકેટના સંબંધમાં જણાયલા છે, તેવણુ સાથ વાત કરતાં મેં ઉપર મુજબ તેવણને કહ્યું, જોના જવાબમાં જે તેવણુ કહી શક્યા તે એ કે કેટલાક દુર પડેલા અમલદારો જેઓ સારા ક્રીકેટરો હતા, તેઓ નામદાર ગવરનર લારડ હેરીસની કાળજીથી ભેગા થઈ શક્યા, જેથી જે મેચો કદાચ ભાગી પડતે તે રમી શકાઈ. આ નખળી દલીલ હું કહી શકું. વળી કેટલાક જેઓ એ નામદારને વખાણવાનું બેઠા છે, તેઓ મોટી મેચોમાં આખો દહાડો લારડ હેરીસે હાજર થઈ ક્રીકેટને ઉત્તેજન આપ્યું એવું ગણાવા માગે છે. કેવી ખેંચતાણની વાત ! લારડ હેરીસ ક્રીકેટના માત્ર સાધારણુ શોખીન નથી, પણ તેથી વધુ છે, એ વાત ખેશક જણીતી છે. એ નામદાર કુડીબંધ મેચો રમ્યા છે, ધણીક મેચો જોવા પધાર્યા હતા, પણ તેથી અંગબળની કસરતોને શું ખાસ ઉત્તેજન મળેલું લેખાય ? એ નામદારની હાજરીથી અલબત્તે રમતમાં તે વખતે ઉલટ વધી હતી પણ તેની અસર ચાલુ અથવા કાયમ શું રહી છે તે આપણે જોતા કે જાણતા નથી, તેમ વખાણનારાઓ કહી શકતા નથી. આ અઠવાડયામાં પુના શેહેરમાં નામદાર ગવરનરની યાદગારી કાયમ રાખવાની હીલચાલ ઉભી કરેલી જણાય છે, અને તેની શરૂઆત કરતાં એક પુના રહીશ પારસી અહસથ જે ધણામાં ધણું બોલી શક્યા તે એજ કે તે નામદારે અંગબળની કસરતને ઉત્તેજન આપ્યું છે, પણ તે શું તે તેવણુ જણાવવાની તસદી લઈ શક્યા નથી. કવચીત તેમના મનમાં પુના જીમખાનાની જગ્યા મશત વાપરવાની સરકારે રજા આપી છે તે હશે. પણ તેવાં જીમખાનાઓની રજાઓ ખીજ ગવરનરો આપી ગયા છે. મુંબઈની એવી હીલચાલમાં પણ કેટલાક જાણીતા અહસથો દોરવાઈ જઈ બોલ્યા છે કે તેવણે અંગબળની કસરતોને બહુ ઉત્તેજન આપ્યું છે, પણ કોઈ પણ અહસથ પોતાના બોલવાને દાખલાઓથી ટેકા આપી શક્યા નથી. પણ બ્યારે હું કહું છું કે ક્રીકેટ માટે એ નામદાર ખાસ કર્યું નથી, ત્યારે મારા બોલવાના ટેકામાં હું કોઈથી પણ ના માડી તક્લી શકાય એવો દાખલો આપું છું. કોઈ પણ

ક્રીકેટનો શોખીન ક્રીકેટ રમવાના મેદાનમાં “ પોલો ” રમવા દેવાની હીમા-  
યત કરી શકશે નહીં. એ તદ્દન દેખઈતી વાત છે અને નામદાર લારડ  
હેરીસ ક્રીકેટના પુરેપુરા શોખીન હોવા છતાં, એ નામદાર ક્રીકેટની જગ્યા-  
પર મુઠીબર ગ્રહાયેલા ‘ પોલો ’ રમે તે સામે સેંકડો ક્રીકેટરોને જરૂરની  
સગવડ આપી શક્યા નથી, એ ક્રીકેટને ઉત્તેજન કે ?

મુ’બદ, તા. ૨૫ મી જાનેવારી ૧૮૯૫.

લા. શા. સો.

૬

નામદાર લારડ હેરીસના “ મીત્રો તથા વખાણના-  
રાઓ ” ની મળેલી સભા અને પ્રજા અક્ષીપ્રાય.

મુ’બદના વીદાય થતા હાકેમ સાહેબ લારડ હેરીસના “ મીત્રો તથા  
વખાણનારાઓ ” મુ’બદના ટાઉન હોલમાં પોતાની મરજી મુજબ તારીફના  
પોકારો કરી, શેહેરનાં ખીન્ન ખુલ્લામાં એક મેહેલમાં ખીરાજેલા હાકેમ  
સાહેબની હાજરીમાં તારીફના અવાજે બાહર પાડી ધરે જઈ બેઠા છે,  
પણ તે વીશે નીરાંતે અભીપ્રાય બાંધવાની આપણને જોગવાઈ મળે છે.  
મુ’બદ શેહેરમાં થોડાક વગવાળા સાહેબો જો માથે લે, એ અંત બતાવે,  
તો આહે તે કામ કરી શકે, પ્રજાને નામે વટીક આહે તે બનાવને બહુ  
મોડું ૨૫ આપી શકે. હાલના ગવરનર સાહેબની કારકીરદી નીબૂજ ની-  
વડી છે, ઇલાકાની મોટી પ્રજાને બહુ નીશા કરનારી નીવડી છે, કામ  
કોમો વચે કમનસીબ અંતરને આડકતરી રીતે વધુ ફેલાવે આપનારી  
નીવડી છે, ઈલાકાની કેળવણીને ખીલવવાને પુરતું ઉત્તેજન ન આપતાં  
સથાનીક સ્વરાજ્યના હકને પ્રજાની લાયકાત મુજબ આગળ વધવા દેવાને  
અહલે ૨૬કા લગાડનારી નીવડી છે, એવું ઇલાકાની પ્રજાને બહુ મોટો  
આગ બરેબર માને છે, અને તોમણ નામદાર લારડ હેરીસના થોડાક  
વગવાળા મીત્રો આ દેશની પ્રજાને અને આકસર કરી ગ્રેટબ્રીટનની બહુ  
કુર પડેલી પ્રજાને એવું બતાવવાની ખાચેસ રાખે છે કે, એ નામદારની  
કારકીરદી બહુ ફતેહમંદ નીવડી છે. “ મીત્રો તથા વખાણનારાઓ ” ને

પોતાની મરજી મુજબ પોતાનાં દીલની મા સભયતાની લાગણી બાહેર પાડવાનો દરેકને હક છે, તેઓએ પ્રજા વીરધતાનું બળ ધ્યાનમાં લઈ સાદું ડાહ્યપણ વાપરી પોતાની હીલચાલને પ્રજાની હીલચાલનું રૂપ ન આપેલું હોવાથી, તેઓને પોતાની એવી સભયતાભરી લાગણી યાને નામદાર લારડ હેરીસ સાહેબને હરખાવનારી લાગણી બાહેર પાડવાનો દરેક હક છે અને તેઓની એ મળહમાં, નામદાર લારડ હેરીસને ખુશી કરવાની તેઓની એવી ઇતિબરીમાં આપણે ખલસ કરવા માંગતા નથી, તોપણ સામાન્ય પ્રજા શુધારે છે તે પણ બાહેર પાડવાની જરૂર હોવાથી, પ્રમાણીક ધારણાના લેખકોની દ્રવ્ય છે કે માનપુરવક રીતે તે લાગણી પણ રજુ કરવી.

નામદાર લારડ હેરીસના “ મીત્રો તથા વખાણનાઓ ” એ નામદારની કારકીરદીથી, તેઓ જણાવે છે તેટલા હરખાઈ ગયા છે, એ કારકીરદી ઉપર એટલા બધા શીદા થઈ ગયા છે, તો તેઓની દ્રવ્ય હતી—નામદાર લારડ હેરીસને વધારે ધનસાદુ અપાવા માટે તેઓની દ્રવ્ય હતી—કે એ નામદારની વીદાયગીરી પછી, એ નામદારને લઈ જનારી સદીમર “કલાઈડ” મેડીટરેનીયન દરીયામાં દાખલ થવા પછી આ હીલચાલ કરવી જોઈતી હતી, તેવણની વીદાયગીરી પછી ફૂંડ ઉભું કરી આવી “ મીત્રો તથા વખાણનાઓ ” ની સભા મેલવની જોઈતી હતી. પણ એ સાહેબોએ કદાચ ચીંતા રાખી હશે કે તેઓની તે કારોશ તદ્દન નીષ્ફળ નીવડતે, તેમજ નામદાર લારડ હેરીસની પોતાની જાણમાં પણ આવતે નહીં કે, કયા સાહેબો તેવણને માનપાન આપવાની દોડાદોડી કરે છે, જેથી ડાહ્યપણમરયો માર્ગ એ નામદારની ગવરનર તરીકેના અમલમાંજ આ ધામધુમ કરી દેવાનું તેઓએ આ ઉતાવળયું પગલું ભરી દીધું છે. પણ ઑનરેબલ મીં જાઝલભાઈ વીશરામ, ઑનરેબલ મીં નવરોજી નશરવાનજી વહાડયા, મીં અબ્દુલલા મેરઅલી ધરમસી, માજી શેરીફ ડાકટર કાવસજી હોરમ સજી, સર્મૅલકૅલ કોરટના જડજ મીં હોરમસજી દાદાભાઈ તથા કસ્ટમ સના મદદનીશ કલેક્ટર મીં જહાંગીર ડોસાભાઈ દુરામજી બરાબર જાણે છે કે, નામદાર લારડ હેરીસના અમલ વીશે આ ઇલાકાની—અકસર કરી મુબઇ સેહેરની—દેશી પ્રજાની સામાન્ય લાગણી કેવી નીરાશીની છે. એ મહસયોમાં ડાકટર કાવસજી હોરમસજીને જુદી જુદી દેશી કોમોની લાગણી જાણવાની બહુ વધુ સમવડો છે, પોતાના મળતા વડાપણથી, સમળી કોમોમાં બેળાવાની મીદાસભરી કાળજીથી ખરી લાગણી જાણવાની બહુ વધુ સમવડો છે, અને તે છતાં તેણે નામદાર લારડ હેરીસના અમલની

અતીથ તારીફ ગાનારું ને ભાષણ કર્યું છે, તે વાંચી આપણને અન્યથી ઉપજે છે. ગમે તે હોય, પણ આ હીલચાલના આગેવાનોએ એ નામદારના અમલને બહુ ફતેહમંદ નીવડેલો દેખાડવાની લીધેલી અથાગ મેહેનતનાં પરીણામ તરીકે તેઓએ ને સભા મેળવી છે, તે સભા મારફતેજ બાણે સ્વતંત્ર પ્રજાની વધારે ખાતરી કરી આપી છે કે, આ હીલચાલ તરફ પ્રજાની દીલસોજી નથી. સભામાં જુદી જુદી દરખાસતો વચેરે રજુ કરવા માટે ૧૪ આગેવાન શેહેરીઓને બાહર પાડવામાં આવવા હતા, પણ એ ૧૪ આગેવાન શેહેરીઓમાં મુબઈ શહેરનો એકપણ હીંદુ અહસથ જેવામાં આવતો નથી! આપણ સધળાઓ જાણ્યે છીએ કે, આ ઇલાકાની વસતીનો બહુ મોટો ભાગ હીંદુઓનો છે, અને તોપણ નામદાર લારડ હેરીસની જાળમાં તારીફ કરનારાં મંડળમાં એવી તારીફ કરવા માટે, એકાદ દરખાસતરે “હું ટેકા આપું છું” એટલાંજ ભાષણનો ટેકો અપાવવા માટે, મુબઈ શહેરનો એક પણ હીંદુ અહસથ રજુ થયેલો સભાના પ્રગટ થયેલા રીપોર્ટ ઉપરથી જાણ્યો નથી. એ હીંદુ અહસથોએ સભામાં નામદાર લારડ હેરીસના અમલની બહુ તારીફ કરનારાં ભાષણો કર્યાં હતાં એ ખરી વાત છે, પણ તેઓ ખેડ પુનાના અહસથો છે, નેઓમાનાં એક માણ સરકારી અમલદાર તથા ખીજા દખણના વતનદાર છે. સર જમશેદજી જીજીભાઈ તથા સર દીનશાહ માણેકજી પીટીટ જેવા આ ઇલાકાના એ પહેલા અહસથોને એવી હીલચાલમાં સામેલ થવાની ને ફરજ પડે, તે આપણે પીછાનયે છીએ અને તેઓને ઈનસાફને ખાતર બાદ કરતાં, બાકીના ૧૨ બોલનારાઓમાં એ યુરોપીયન વેપારી અહસથો હતા, એક ધારાસભામાં નેમાયલા દેશી ઑનરેબલ અહસથ હતા, એક મુબઈના છેલ્લા શેરીફ હતા, જેવણ પોતાની અસાધારણ સમયતા માટે યાદગારીની દરેક હીલચાલમાં ઉલટમંદ હીસો આપવા માટે જાણીતા છે, જેવણ ખરેખરી લીબરલ લાગણીના માનવંત વાઇસરાય લારડ રીપન તથા નામદાર હાકેમ લારડ રેની યાદગારીની હીલચાલોમાં પણ ઉલટમંદ ભાગ લઈ, હાલની હીલચાલમાં પણ તેવો ઉલટમંદ ભાગ લીધો છે. બાકીના બોલનારાઓમાં એ સરકારી પેનશનરો તથા ચાર અહસથો, મેસરસ એચ. એ. એકવરથ, વેનરેબલ આરચડીકન, મીં જહાંગીર ડોસાભાઈ ફરામજી તથા મીં હોરમસજી દાદાભાઈ સરકારી નોકરીમાં છે. સરકારી નોકરોને એવી હીલચાલમાં સામેલ થવાનો તેમજ પોતાની ખરી લાગણી જાહેર કરવાનો હક નથી, એમ કહેવાની અમો ખેઅદબી કરીએજ નહીં, પણ આપણે

એટલું તો કહી શક્યે કે, આ હીલચાલના આગેવાન સાહેબોએ એ હીલ-ચાલને મોટું રૂપ આપવાની પોતાની ખાએસ પાર પાડવા માટે, સરકારી અમલદારોને મુખ્ય બોલનારાઓ તરીકે રજૂ કર્યા ન હોતે, તો તેઓએ પોતાની હીલચાલને વધારે લાભ કર્યો હોતે; પણ કદાચ આ સભામાં એ નામદારના અમલની સ્તુતી કરવા માટે ખીન સરકારી પ્રજામાંથી એવા સારા બોલનારાઓ મળી શક્યા ન હશે.

તારીખ ૩૧ મી જાનેવારી ૧૮૯૫.

### ૭

નામદાર લારડ હેરીસના “મીતરો તથા વખાણના રાઓ”નાં ડેપ્યુટેશનને મળેલો જવાબ.

મુંબઈના વીઠાય થતા હાકેમ નામદાર લારડ હેરીસની નીષ્ફળ નીવડેલી કારકીરદીને ક્તેહમંદ જણાવી તેનાં ગમે તેમ બાકાં ટુકવાને, એવી કારકીરદીની સામે બાહર પડી ચુકેલા મજબુત દેશી અવાજને એ રીતે જણે હાંકી નાખવાને, રજૂ થતી કોશેશો જોઈ આપણને બહુ રમુજ મળે છે. હાલના આગળ વધેલા જમાનામાં પણ પ્રજાલોગણીનો એમ અનાદર કરવાની કોશેશો થાય, એ અજાયબ જોવું છે. ભાષ્ય ૪ “ઠાઈમસ ઓફ ઈંડયા”ના ગયા સનીવારના અંકમાં તેનો રાખેતાનો એક લખનાર એથી પણ હદ ઓળંગી અભીપ્રાય આપે છે કે, “થોડા વખતમાં મુંબઈ છેલ્લાં ૫૦ વરસમાં થયેલા સઘળા ગવરનરોમાંનો પોતાને સહૃદી લોકપ્રીય ગવરનર ખોનાર છે અને તેથી ફક્ત સઘળા ક્રીકેટરોજ નહી, પણ ખીજા દરેક જણ હસીને થશે.” એમાં પણ “ક્રીકેટ”નેજ આગેવાન હીસો મળે છે! નામદાર લારડ હેરીસના અમલની રજૂ થતી ખુબીઓમાં મુખ્ય ખુબી તેવણુ એક અમ્છા ક્રીકેટર છે, ધણી ક્રીકેટ મેચો ગવરનર તરીકેના પોતાના અમલમાં રમ્યા છે, પોતાના અમલમાં ધણી મેચો આખો વખત જોવા પધાર્યા છે, એવી ખુબીઓ ગાવામાં આવે છે અને એવી ખુબીઓ ગાવાથી નામદાર લારડ હેરીસની એક રાજદવારી નર તરીકેની કીરતીમાં વધારો થતો હોય, તો એ નામદારના મીતરો અને વખાણનારાઓનો એ હરખ આપણે હીનવી લેવા માગતા નથી, ખીજા કોઈ પણ ગવરનર નામ-

દાર લારડ હેરીસની ગવાતી એવી સુખ્ય ખુબી માટે અદેખાઈ કરશે નહીં. એક હાકેમ સાહેબના અમલમાંજ, તેવણુની યાદગારી કાયમ રાખવાને સભા મેળવવામાં આવે, તે સારા ધોરણુને ખાતર પસંદ કરવાએજ બનાવ નથી; અને નામદાર લારડ હેરીસના વારંવાર રજુ થતા અવાસ મુજબ આપણે તો વડી રાખતાહતા કે, એ નામદાર પોતાના એ મીત્રોને એવાં પગલાંથી વારશે, પોતાની વીદાયગીરી પછીજ સવાલ ઉઠાવવો એવી સુચના કરશે, પણ આપણી તે વાજખી ઉમેદ પાર પડી નથી. એ નામદારના યાદગારીનો અમલમાંજ એવી સભા મળી છે એટલુંજ નહીં પણ તે સભાને નામે એક ડેપ્યુટેશન નામદાર લારડ હેરીસને સેક્રેટરીયેટમાં ભેટી આવયું છે, મજકુર સભામાં પસાર થયેલા ઠરાવો તેવણુ સનમુખ મેલી આવયું છે, જેને લગતી પુરતી વીગત અમારા ગયા શનીવારના અંકમાં પ્રગટ થઈ હતી. આ નવાંજ જેવા પ્રસંગ વખતે ભાષણ કરતાં નામદાર લારડ હેરીસે આપણને નીરાશ કરનારી ખબર આપી કે એ યાદગારીનાં ફંડતું શું કરવું તે માટે તેવણે પોતે કાંઈ વીચાર જાહેર કર્યોજ નથી, જેથી ગયા મંગળવારની સભામાં તેવણુને નામે થયેલા ખુલાસો જુલભર્યો હતો અને યાદગારી કેમ કાયમ રાખવી, તે તો નાણાં ભરનારાઓનું પોતાનુંજ કામ છે. આ ખુલાસાથી પ્રજાને નીરાશી ઉપજે છે કે વળી આવલાંનો સવાલ નવેસરથી ઉભો થશે, નાણાંની મોટી રકમ પથરનાં કડકામાં નાહકની ગુમાઇ જવાની, પ્રજાને કાંઈ પણ લાભ આપવા વગર ગુમાઇ જવાની ચીંતા રહેશે. હજી પણ આપણે ઈચ્છે છીએ કે છેલ્લાં પાંચ વરસમાં ઇલાકાની પ્રજાને નીરાશી આપેલા અમલ પછી એક નીરજીવ બદલો યા સંતોશ એ નીરાશ થયેલી પ્રજાને નામદાર લારડ હેરીસના “ મીત્રો તથા વખાણુનારાઓ ” આપવા માગતા હોય, તો પથરનાં આવલાંમાં મોટી રકમ ગુમાવી દઇ, તે આવલાં તરફ અણુગમાની આંગળી સદા બતાવવાની પ્રજાને જોગવાઈ આપવાના કરતાં પ્રજાને લાભ આપે એવું કાંઈ ઉપયોગી ખાતું સ્થાપવાનું ડાહખણુ બતાવવું એવો ડાહખણુભર્યો મારગ અખતયાર કરવામાં આવે છે કે નહીં, તે હવે પછી જોવાનું રહ્યું છે.

નામદાર લારડ હેરીસે પોતાનાં એ ભાષણમાં જણાવયું હતું કે, આ ઈલાકામાં વસતી જુદી જુદી કોમોની મગજ સંબંધી શક્તી વીશે તેમનાં મગજમાં અતીશય ઉંચો વીચાર બેઠો છે. મુજબ ઈલાકાનાં લોકોની મગજ શક્તી વીશે એ નામદારને બહુ ઉંચો વીચાર બેઠો છે, એવું જ્યારે એ નામદારે જાહેર કર્યું છે, ત્યારે એ ઉંચી મગજ શક્તીવાળી

પ્રજ્ઞએ બાંધેલા સામાન્ય વીચારને પણ માન મળવું જોઈએ છે કે નામદાર લારડ હેરીસની ગુવર્નર તરીકેની કારકીરદી નીશકળ નીવડી છે અને એવી નીશકળ નીવડેલી કારકીરદીની યાદગારી કાયમ રાખવાની કોશેશ કરવી, તે પ્રજ્ઞ લાગણીને અનુસરતું નથી. નામદાર લારડ હેરીસના વહાલા એકપુરા નાના દીકરાની તખીયત નાદરસત આસે તે સાંભળી આપણુ એકેએક મુખધગરે દલગીર થઇએ છીએ, બાળક આનરેખલ જ્યોરજ હેરીસ બેલમેટના મેહેલની વેલાતી તાજી હવામાં રહેવાથી જલદીથી આસુ-દગીભરી છાંદગી ભોગવતા થઇ પોતાનાં કુટુંબની કીરતીમાં વધારો કરે, એવી આપણુ એકેએક મુખધગરે વશાદારી સાથે દુવા ગુજરે છે છીએ; તેમજ પોતાના વહાલા એકપુરા દીકરાની સારી તખીયત માટે નામદાર લારડ હેરીસને દરરોજ જે ઇતેન્નરી લાગતી હોય, તેનો આપણુ સઘળા દેશીઓ પુરતો ખયાલ કરી શક્યે. પણ જ્યારે નામદાર લારડ હેરીસ જણાવે છે કે, હાંદુસતાન દેશમાં નોકરી બજાવવાને આવતા ઇંગ્લેન્ડ ઉપર એ મોટી મુસીબત છે, ત્યારે તે વીચારે સાથ આપણે એકમત થઇ શકતા નથી, એમ માનપુરવક રજુ કરવું પડે છે. દેશવટો ભોગવનારા દરેક આસામીના બાબમાં એમજ બને છે. ઘોઘેથી આવતો એક ગરીબ હાંદી ખારવો દરીયા દોહોવવા જાય, તો તેને પણ એવી મુશકેલી ખમવી પડે છે; ઇંગ્લંડથી આગ્રેલયા જતા એક ઓધેદાર યા વેપારીને પણ એવીજ મુશકેલી ખમવી પડે છે; ઇંગ્લંડથી કેપ કોસોની યા નેટલ યા જેમકા વગેરે દુરદરાજ ભાગોમાં જતા ઇંગ્લેન્ડને પણ એવીજ મુશકેલી ખમવી પડે છે. છતાં મોટે દરમાયે સામાન્ય રીતે સારી સુખી છાંદગી આ દેશમાં ગુજરવા આવતા ઇંગ્લેન્ડ અમલદારોને પોતાના કુટુંબની માંદગી વખતે જે ઇતેન્નરીમાંથી પસાર થવું પડે, તે ઇતેન્નરીનેજ કાં એવું મોટું રૂપ આપવામાં આવે, કાં અસાધારણ લેખવામાં આવે, તે આપણે જોઇ શકતા નથી. હાંદુસતાનમાં મોટા પમારની નોકરીએ આવતા અમલદારો હાંદી તીજેરીમાંથી બહુ વધુ લાભો મેળવવા માટે એવુંજ જણાવતા આવયા છે કે, તેઓને પોતાનાં કુટુંબ કપીલાથી દુર થવું પડે છે, હાંદુસતાનમાં “કંગાળ એકાંત છાંદગી” ગુજરવી પડે છે, વગેરે; અને એવા નાહકના પેકારને નામદાર લારડ હેરીસે આડકતરે ઉતેજન આપેલું ગણાય, એમ માનપુરવક રીતે અમને જણાવવું પડે છે. દુનીયામાં સઘળા માનવીઓને સંસારી સંકટો, હાડમારીઓ વગે-માંથી પસાર થવું પડે છે અને જેઓ પરદેશમાં કામકાજ યા ધંધાધાપા અર્થે જાય તે સઘળાંઓને, શું હાંદુસતાનમાં કે આગ્રેલયામાં કે સડરેટસ

સંસ્થાનમાં કે દક્ષીણ આફ્રીકામાં સમજે ઠેકાણે, એમ દેશવટાનાં કુટુંબથી વીખુટા પડવાનાં સંકટો ખમવાંજ પડે છે, તો દક્ષિણ એંગ્લો ઇન્ડિયનોનાજ કુટુંબી જુદાપાને નાહકનું મોટું રૂપ મળવું જોઈતું નથી.

તા. ૪ થી ફેબ્રુઆરી ૧૮૯૫.

૮

મુંબઈના ગવરનર નામદાર લારડ હેરીસને વીદાય-  
ગીરીનો છેલ્લો “ ખુલ્લો પત્ર.”

મારા લારડ,

તમે નામદારના “ મીત્રો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ” તમારી ગમે તેટલી સ્તુતી કરવા, તમારા કહેવાતા ઉત્તમ અમલનાં ગાનાંઓ ગાવા, તમારી ખુશાલ પરોણાગત કરવાની હરીફાઈઓ કરવામાં હાલ રોકાઈ ગયા છે, દોડાદોડીમાં પડ્યા છે, પણ તેઓમાંથી એક પણ ભાઈએ તમારા સંબંધમાં ગયા રવીવારે બનેલા ખુશખબતીભર્યા બનાવ માટે તમને મુખ્ય-રકબાદી આપી હોય એવું મેં જોયું નથી. તમારા “ મીત્રો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ” માંનો હું એક નથી, તમારા અમલથી નીરાશ થયલાઓમાં હું એક છું, પણ મારાં નામદાર મહારાણીજનાં તમે પ્રતીનીધી હોવાથી, તમારાં ભલાંમાં સદા કાળજી લેતો આવ્યો છું અને મારી એવી કાળજી હોવાથીજ ગયા રવીવારે તમે નામદારની વરસગાંઠ ગઈ હતી, તમે નામદારે ૪૪ વરસની વય પુરી કરી ૪૫ માં વરસની શરૂઆત કરી હતી, તે વરસ તમે તથા તમારાં વહાલાંઓને ખુશખબતી ભર્યું નીવડે, એવી મેં તો મારા કીરતાર પાસે એ સવારના પ્રારથના કરી હતી, જેવી પ્રારથના તમારા હાલ બહુ ઉલટમાં આવેલા “ મીત્રો તથા વખાણુનારાઓ ” માંથી કેટલાઓએ કરી હતી. તે કદાચ તમે નામદારને ખબર હશે. એમ બોલતાં તમે નામદારના “ મીત્રો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ” ને છેકેજ ગેરમનસાફ કરવા હું ઇછતો નથી, તેઓ ખરાં દીલની લાગણીથી તમારી હાકેમ તરીકેની કારકીરદીથી ખુશ ખુશ થઈ ગયા હશે, પણ બ્યારે તેઓમાંના કેટલાકો હદ બાહરે ઉલટમાં આવી તમને મોટું કહે-વડાવવા માટે, કેશી પ્રજ્ઞમતને ખીજવવા માટે બ્યારે એટલા સુધી કહે-



વાની બેઅઘ્ની કરે છે કે, છેલ્લાં ૫૦ વરસમાં મુ'બઈ ઇલાકાને તમારા જેવા ફતેહમંદ ગવરનર ખીજો મળયો નથી ત્યારે તેઓનાં તવારીખ સંબંધી જ્ઞાન માટે મને તો બહુ હસતું આવે છે, અને મારી ખાતરી છે કે તમે પણ તમારાં મન સાથે બોલતા હશે કે, “મારા એવા ખુશામતીઆઓથી મને બચાવો !” તમારી કારકીરદી વીશે પુરતું બોલાઈ ચુકેલું હોવાથી, સમજીઓને પ્રજા લાગણી બરાબર જણાઈ ચુકેલી હોવાથી, તમે જેવા એક સમજી તીક્ષ્ણ લાગણીવાળા ઉમરાવ પણ પ્રજા લાગણીથી પુરતા વાકેફ થઈ ચુકેલા હોવાથી, તે ઢોળાયલાં દુધ માટે વધુ બલાપો કરી તમારી વીદાયગીરીને ટાકણે તમને વધારે નાખુશ કરવાની અણુગમતી દ્રરજથી મારા આ “ખુલ્લાં પત્ર” માં હું વેગજોજ રહેવા ધારું છું.

ખરેખર તમે નામદારને હાકીમ તરીકેનો અમલ એક મોટી મુશ-કેલી વચ્ચે શરૂ કરવો પડ્યો હતો. એક અતી લોકપ્રીય નીવડેલા લીબરલ હાકેમે (નામદાર લારડ રેએ) દેશીઓનાં હઈડાંમાં રાજદારી વધારાની અનેક પ્રકારની ઉલટ ઉસકેરવા પછી, તમે નામદાર એ ખાલી પડેલો ઓધો લેવા આવ્યા હતા, જે તમારે માટે તેમજ અમો મુ'બઈગરાઓ માટે કમ-નશીખ હતું. હું ઇચ્છું છું કે “કાળા આદમીઓ” માટે મોટી સુગ રાખનારા ધઈના રંગના માણ કનઝરવેટીવ વડા પ્રધાન લારડ સાલસબરીએ તમને મુ'બઈના હાકેમનો ઓધો આપવાની માગણી કરી, તે વખતે એ મુશકેલી વીશે અણુગમાની કસોટી ઉપર આવવા અગાઉ તમેએ વધારે ગંભીર વીચાર કર્યો હોત, એક હીંદી ઇલાકાની ગવરનરશીપ પસંદ કરવાને બદલે આપે વીકટોરયા યા ન્યુ સાઉથ વેલસ જેવાં એકાદ આસ-ટરેલયન સંસ્થાનના ગવરનરનો ઓધો પસંદ કર્યો હતો, તો તમેએ પોતાનાં નામને વધુ લાભ કર્યો હતો, અને એવા સંસ્થાનના સારા લોક-પ્રીય ગવરનર નીવડ્યા હોત એ બનવાબેગ છે, સખખ આસ્ટરેલયન ગવરનરોને માથે હીંદી ગવરનરો જેટલી જોખમદારીઓ હોતી નથી, ત્યાંની પારલામેન્ટ ત્યાંના રાજકારોબારની જોખમદારીઓ ઉપાડી લે છે, જ્યારે આસ્ટરેલીયન પ્રજા પોતાના ગવરનરો પાસેથી ફેશનેબલ મેળાવડાઓ, ખાણી ખીણીની પાર્ટીઓ વગેરેની વધારે વધી રાખે છે, જેમાં આપ કુશળ હોવાથી, એવા મેળાવડાઓના શોખીન હોવાથી, તેઓને તમે બહુ રાજી રાખી શકો, વીદાયગીરી વખતે તેઓની બહુ લોકપ્રીયતા જાહેર કરાવી તેઓનો ખેદ રજૂ કરાવી શકો. આપ આસ્ટરેલયામાં ફરી આવ્યા છો, હીંદુસ્તાનની પણ મુલાકાત લઈ ગયા હતા, હીંદીવાનોના રાજદારી વધારાની લડતોની

બાહર પડતી માગણીઓ વખતે મુલાકાત લઇ મયા હતા, અને તે છતાં આ અથાગ મહેતનવાળા ખટપટયા હીંદી ગવરનરના ઓધાની આપે કાં પસંદગી કરી, તે મારા જેવો એક કાચી સમજ શક્તીનો માણસ પીછાની શકતો નથી. હીંદી ધારાસભાઓની કક્ષાઓની બેઠકો તમને પસંદ પડતી ન હતી, એમ હું ધારું છું અને હું જુલોતો નહીં હોયું તો તમારા મીત્ર અને મધરાસ હલાકાના હાલના ગવરનર લારડ વેનલોકે એક રમુજી બા-પણુમાં ૮ વરસની વાત ઉપર તેનો કાંઈક ખ્યાલ આપ્યો હતો. ગમે તેમ હોય, પણ પોતાને લાયક ઓધાની કેમ પસંદગી કરવી, તેનો લારડ ખાસીએ ખીન્ન ઉમરાવોને વધારે સારો બોધ આપ્યો છે. તમો નામદાર જેવા વીલાયતના રાજદવારી મંડળોથી પુરતા જાણીતા ઉમરાવને યાદ આપવાની કાંઈ જરૂર હોયજ નહીં કે લારડ ખાસી જે ઈચ્છતે, તે હીંદુસ્તાનના વાર્ષસરાયનો ઓધો બહુ સહેલાઈથી મેળવી શકતે, પોતા તરફથી ઈસારો કરવાથીજ મેળવી શકતે, પણ તેવણે પોતાની છેલ્લી હીંદી મુલાકાત વખતે જોયું હશે કે હીંદુસ્તાનના વાર્ષસરાય યા ગવરનરના ઓધાઓની જોખ-દારીઓ કેટલી બધી વધી ગઈ છે, એંગલો ઇડયનો, વધુ અને વધુ લાભો મેળવવાના, દેશીઓને પોતાનાં સ્વદેશના રાજકારોબારથી બને તેમ દુર અને દુર રાખવાના બળવંત પોકારોથી એક વાર્ષસરાય યા ગવરનરને પોતાની મરજી મુજબ, પોતાની સવતંત્ર લાગણી મુજબ અમલ ચલાવવામાં કેવી અડચણ કરનારા થઈ પડે છે, તે નામદારની સ્વતંત્ર કારકી-રદીને કેવા ખરાબા ઉપર ધસડી લઈ જઈ શકે છે, જેથી દુરઅંદેશી વાપરી કરોડપતી લારડ ખાસીએ હીંદી વાર્ષસરાય યા મુ'બઈના ગવરનરના ઓધા કરતાં વીકટોરીયા સંસ્થાનના ગવરનરના ઓધા દરમખા તથા ઉતરતા ઓધાને વધારે પસંદ કરી, તે ઓધો ખુશીથી સ્વીકાર્યો છે. મારા લારડ, માનપુરવક રીતે હું રજી કહું કે, તમો નામદારે પણ એવીજ પસંદગી કરી હતે, તો તમારી નામના વધારી હતે, કદાચ કીરતી પણ વધારી હતે, અને હાલ હીંદી પ્રજા અણગમના પોકારમાં આવી પડ્યા છે, તે અણ-ગમતી હાલતમાંથી સદંતર દુર થઈ મયા હતે.

મારા લારડ, આપ એક અચ્છ કીકેટર છો અને કીકેટની રમતમાં ખીન્ન કોઈ પણ ગવરનર યા વાર્ષસરાય કરતાં મોટું ધ્યાન આપેલું હોવાથી, સરકારી મેહલમાં ખાણી પીણીના એંગલો ઇડયનો માટે મુ'બઈના છેલ્લા ૪ ગવરનરો કરતાં બહુ વધુ મેળાવડાઓ કરેલા હોવાથી, દેશી પ્રજાના સારા ભાગનાં મન ઉપર એવો વીચાર ઠસી ગયો છે કે, આપ રમતમગત અને

ખાણી પીણીના મેળાવડાઓમાં બહુ રોકાઓ છે તો ઇલાકાના રાજકારોબાર માટે જોઈતો વખત રોકીજ કેમ શક્યા હશે ? પણ એવો ખ્યાલ કરનારાઓ જુલો જાય છે કે આપ બહાદુર લશ્કરી તુખમથી ઉતરેલા છો, ઇશવર કરપાથી આપ શરીરનો પતળો મજબુત બાંધે ધરાવો છો, અને હજી તો ૪૫ વરસની ભર જવાન વયનાં કહિવતમાંથી પસાર થાઓ છો, તો રાજકારોબારની ઝુસરી એવા કહિવતમંદ નરને, ખાણીપીણી અને મેળાવડાઓના સુખવાસ છતાં મારી પડે નહી. આપ ઉદ્યોગી છો એમ હું જાણું છું, મારા બોલવાને વધુ ટેકા આપવા માટે મારી ખાનગી જાણમાં આવેલી ખીના પણ રજુ કરી દેવાની બેઅદખી કરું કે, ઇલાકાના રાજકારોબારને લગતી સધળી ખીનાઓ ગવરનરની મારફતે પસાર થયેલી જેવાની આપે ખાએસ રાખી છે, બલકે નોંધ પણ કરેલી કહેવાય છે કે, “રાજકારોબાર માટે ગવરનર પોતે જોખમદાર હોવાથી સધળું સરકારી કામકાજ તેવજુની પોતાની જાણ ચગર પસાર થતું જોઈએ નહી.” આ તમારી ખાએસ બહુ માનભરી છે, અને હું ઇચ્છું કે એજ ખાહેશ મુજબનો આપે પાંચ વરસની કારકીરદી દરમિયાન અમલ કર્યો હતો, તો આવતા સનીવારે બહુ ફતેહમંદ લોકપ્રીય ગવરનર તરીકે આખી પ્રજાનાં માનપાન તથા વીદાયગીરીના આંસુડાં સાથે પાછા ફર્યા હોતે. પણ તમે નામદાર વીચારો બાંધી દેવામાં કેટલાક ઉતાવળયા જણાયા છે, તેમ તમારી ઉપર પણ એવો ભુલભર્યો વીચાર ઠસી ગયલો અને લાગે છે કે, હિંદી સનદી નોકરી જાણે આસમાન ઉપરથી ઉતરી આવેલી નોકરી છે, એ નોકરીના અમલદારોજ હિંદુસતાનના સારા રાજકારોબારને લગતો એકલો અનુભવ ધરાવે છે, જેથી એ સીનીલીયનોની સલાહ ઉપર મુખ્ય ધ્યાન આપી તે મુજબ ચાલવામાંજ સલામતી છે. હું ધારું છું કે તમે નામદાર એવો ભુલભર્યો વીચાર બાંધેલો હોવાથી, તમે નામદાર આસપાસ તમારા એંગલો ઇંડયન સલાહકારોનાજ વીટલાઈ ગયલાં મંડળથી એવો વીચાર મજબુત ઠસી ગયલો હોવાથી, તમારી કારકીરદી તમારી બધી નીશઠા જેની કમનસીબે ફતેહમંદ નીવડી નથી. હા, મારા લારડ, હું તમને ઇનસાફ આપવાની મારી પ્રરજ સમજું છું કે, આ ઇલાકાની પ્રજા ઉપર અચ્છો રાજકારોબાર ચલાવવાની તમારાં દીલની નીશઠા હતી, પણ જલદીથી કામ આટોપી દેવાની ઉતાવળમાં અને સીવીલયનો વીરો ઉપલે મજબુત વીચાર તમારા ઉપર પેસી ગયલો હોવાથી, તમારી કારકીરદીનું પરીણામ હમણાના જેવું આવતું છે, જે અમે મુખર્ષિ-અસઓનાં કમનસીબ છે. તમારા ઉતાવળયા સ્વભાવ અને બધી નીશઠાના

સંબંધમાં એકજ દાખલો હું આપી શકું, જે કદાચ જુલ બરચો હોય એમ પણ બનવા ભોગ છે. આપે આડકત્રાંશ જગત ઈલાકાની સંબંધી મયુનીસીપાલિટીઓ પાસેથી રફતે રફતે દુર કરાવી ધરવેરા જેવા સીધા કરની મજબુત હિમાયત કરેલી કેટલીકવાર બહાર પડી છે, જેથી જુદાં જુદાં શેહેરો યા ગામોની દેશી પ્રજાનો અણુગમે વારંવાર બહાર પડ્યો હતો, જે અણુગમે ગુજરાતના જુદા જુદા ભાગોમાંથી વધારે મજબુતીથી ઉભરાર્થ નીકળ્યો હતો. પણ આપ નામદારની જાણમાં જ્યારે હિંદી સરકારના એક આગલા ઠરાવમાં જાહેર થયેલા વીચારો આવ્યા કે, “હિંદુ-સત્તાનના લોકોને સીધા કરતાં આડકતરા કરો વધારે રૂચે છે,” ત્યારે આપ નામદારે વીચાર જાહેર કરેલા કહેવાય છે કે, જે એવી ખીનાથી તમે વાકેફ હો તે ધરવેરાની મજબુત હિમાયતવાળી રાજનીતી આપ પસંદ કરતે નહીં. આ ખીના ખરી કે ખોટી હોય, પણ કોઈ પણ રીતે આપ નામદારે મકમપણું બતાવ્યું હો, કહેવાતી “Heavenborn” સનદી નોકરીના અમલદારો તથા સરકારી સલાહકારોનાં મતને ઘટતી અગત આપવા ઉપરાંત દેશી પ્રજાના વીચારો દેશીઓ મારફતે કુનેહથી બરાબર જાણવાની અને તે જાણવા પછીજ કોઈ પણ સલાહનો ફરજો કરવાની સંભાલ લીધી હો, તો નામદાર લારડે પછીના મુબંધના તમે હાકેમની કારકીરદી વધારે ફાવી નીકળી “continuity of policy” ના કાનુનને વધારે જોખ આપી હો, જે કાનુનની એંગલો ઇંગ્લેન્ડ વારંવાર હિમાયત કરે છે.

મારા લારડ, તમે નામદાર આ ઈલાકાની હાકમાઈ લેવા આવ્યા તે અગાઉ જુદી જુદી દેશી કોમો વચ્ચે મુખ્ય કરી હિંદુ તથા મુસલમાન જેવી બે ખોટી કોમો વચ્ચે, સામટી રીતે જે સારો સંબંધ હતો તેવાજ સંબંધમાં તમારી વીદાયગીરી વખતે તમે એ બે કોમોને મેલી જતા નથી, એ તો તમે નામદાર પણ કબુલ કરશો અને તેનો સબબ પણ ઉપલોજ રજુ થાય. સરકારી અમલદારોની ગમે એવી સલાહ મુજબજ મુખ્ય કરી અમલ કરવાની તમારી એ જુલબરી રાજનીતીના ખરા ખીતાઓ પછવાડે બેસી નીરાંતે મામલો જોતા હશે, જ્યારે વડા તરીકે તમે નામદારને સંબંધો અણુગમે ખમવો પડે છે, એથી ખચીત આઈ-હર્ડુ હાટે છે, પણ સંબંધો રાજકારોબારમાં તે તો ચાલતો આવેલો મામલો છે. તમે નામદારની પાંચ વરસની કારકીરદીમાં પ્રજાને મજેલી અનેક નીરાશીઓનું મુખ્ય મુળ એજ હોવાથી, આગલા પાછલા સંબંધો

ખનાવો યાદ દેવડાવવાની મને જરૂર જણાતી નથી. જેથી એ ભુલની નબળાઈ માટેજ નીરાશી બતાવી, તમારી બધી નીષ્ઠા માટે તમને ઇનસાફ આપવામાં હું સંતોષ પકડું છું.

મારા લારડ છેલ્લાં પાંચ વરસની એવી ગાંધીજીની હાલની વીદાય-ગીરીને ટાંકણે વીસારી દેવી જોઈએ, પણ તમારા “ મીતરો તથા વખાણ નારાઓ ” એ એ ગાંધીજીનો યાદ કરવાને કમનસીબે પ્રજાને જાણે જોગવાઈ કરી આપીછે, તોપણ હું તો મારા અનુભવ ઉપરથી માતું છું કે બોળી હોંદી પ્રજા એ સઘળું જુલો જશે, કદાચ વખત એવો પણ આવશે કે તમારી સ્તુતીનાં ગાનાંઓ પણ ગાશે, તમારી ઉપર મુખારક-બાદી અને ઉપકારના પેગામો પણ મોકલાવશે, તે સઘળું તમારા હાથમાં છે. સ્વદેશ જઈ પુગવા પછી બેલમેંટના મેહલમાં મેડસ્ટન તથા લોરડસ ક્રીકેટ આર્ડેડ ઉપર, અને ઉમરાવોની સભામાં જરાક નવા જુના થયા પછી આ ગરીબડા દેશને નીરાંતે યાદ કરજો, અને સરકારી અમલદારોનાં કુંડાળાંથી ત્યાં નીરાળા રહેનાર હોવાથી, દેશના વતનીઓની લાયકાત તથા લાગણીનો અનુભવ સાથે લઈ જતા હોવાથી આ દેશનાં ખરાં ભલા માટે કાળજી રાખવાની, દેશીઓને ઇનસાફ આપવા માટે જરૂરની વખતે બાથ બીડવાની મેહેરબાની કરજો. પુરવાર થયેલી બધી નીષ્ઠાને તમારા સ્વદેશમાં એવી રીતે કામે લગાડશો, તો ખાતરી રાખજો મારા નામદાર લારડ, કે હોંદીવાનો હાલના નીરાશીના દીવસો તદ્દનજ વીસરી જઈ તમારી ઉપર શીદા શીદા થઈ જશે, ઇડયા આશીસમાં મોટા ઓધા ઉપર આવેલા જોવાની સુધાં ઇતેજારી બતાવશે. એવો ભલો વખત આવેલો જોવાને સદા તરફ રહેલો,

હું છું, મારા લારડ,

તમે નામદારનો સદાનો દાસાતું દાસ,

જાન બાણા ભટ.

તા. ૯ મી ફેબ્રુઆરી ૧૯૪૫



# AKHBAR-I-SOUDAGUR.

૧

મુંબઈના વીદાય થતા ગવરનર લારડ હેરીસને  
માનપાન આપવાની હીલચાલ.



મુંબઈના ગવરનર લારડ હેરીસને એક જીયાદત આપવાની તેમજ એ નામદારે અંગબલની ફેલવણીને આપેલાં ઉત્તેજન માટે, દર વરસે ક્રીકેટ મેચો રમાડીને એક હાલ ભેટ આપવાની ગોઠવણ કરવાને જે સભા ગઈ ૫૨મ દીને સાંજે મેદાન મધેના આપણા એકઝીક્યુટીવ ઈજનેર મી. મનચેરજી કાવસજી મરઝખાનના મકાનમાં બોલાવવામાં આવી હતી, તેની વીગત હમો આપી ગયા છીએ. એ સભાનો રીપોર્ટ આપતાં, એ સભામાં જે અહસચો હાજર થયા હતા, તેઓનાં નામો હમોએ આ રીપોર્ટમાં દાખલ કર્યાં છે અને તેનો હેતુ, ફક્ત એટલોજ હતો કે, એ સભામાં કોણ બીરાજયા હતા તે જાણવાને બની આવે. એ ઉપરથી જોવામાં આવશે કે, સભામાં કુલે ૪૬ અહસચો હાજર થયા હતા, અને તેમાં ૨૩ પારસી, ૫૬૨ મોહમેદનો, સાત હીંદુઓ અને એક ખરીસતી હતા. મુંબઈ શહેરની આઠ લાખ આદમીની વસતીમાંથી એ જાહેર સભામાં આખા ૪૬ અહસચો હાજર થયા હતા, તે પુરતી રીતે બતાવી આપે છે કે, આ હીલચાલ તરફ લોકોનો અણગમો કેટલો છે. લારડ હેરીસે ક્રીકેટની રમતને આપેલું ઉત્તેજન એજ તે નામદારને માન આપવા માટેની મોટી સીફારસ હતી, અને સભામાં ચાલેલાં કામકાજ ઉપરથી માલમ પડે છે કે, તે સીફારસની પણ સભા ઉપર ઝાઝી અસર થઈ ન હતી. પોતાના અણગમતાં કામોની ટીપમાં મધરાસ વીરૂધ પ્રેસીડનસી તેમજ મધરાસ વીરૂધ પારસીઓ વચ્ચે રમાયેલી મોટી મેચોની વખતે મેદાનનો ઉપયોગ કરતાં લોકોને અટકાવીને, તેણે મોટો વખારો કીધો છે. એવી મેચની વખતે મેદાનમાં દસથી વધારે હજાર આદમીઓ એ રમત જોવાને ભેગાં મલે છે, અને ચાલતી રમતમાં તેઓ ઉલટથી ભાગ લે છે. એવા લોકોને એ રમત જોતાં અટકાવીને તેઓ સામે જાપતો નાખનાર હાંકમ લારડ હેરીસ પોતે

હતો, તે છતાં તેના લાગતા વલગતાઓ, તેને એજ રમતને ઉત્તજન આપેલું જણાવીને જાહેરનાં નામથી માન આપવાને બાહર પડ્યા છે, છેતાલીસ ગ્રહસંથોની મલેલી સભામાં તરણુ ગ્રહસંથોએ ખુદી રીતે આ થતી હીલચાલ સામે પોતાનો અભીપ્રાય જાહેર કરવાની હીમત બતાવી હતી. સભાના પરમુખે જો ડાકટર બાહાદુરજીને પોતાના વીચારો સવતંત્રાથી જણાવવા દીધા હોતે તો, એ સભા જે ઠેરાવ કરી ઉઠી છે તે ઠેરાવ તેઓ પસાર કરાવવાને શકતે કે નહીં એ બાબત શકભરેલી લાગે છે. આ હીલચાલની વીરૂધ્ધમાં મત આપનારા તરણુ ગ્રહસંથોમાં બે પારસી અને એક હિંદુ ગ્રહસ્થ હતા, અને સભામાં જે જે દરખાસનો રજુ થઇ હતી, તે માહેલી પેહેલી દરખાસતની તરફેણમાં અને વીરૂધ્ધમાં પુસકલ બોલાયું હતું; પણ વીરૂધ્ધમાં બોલનારને સરનશીન સાહેબે અટકાવીને તે બાબતનો છેડો આણ્યો હતો. તેમ જો થયું ન હોતે તો, એની વીરૂધ્ધમાં જોટલું બોલાયું હતું તેના કરતાં કદાચ વધુ બોલાયા વગર રહેતે નહીં.

મુખ્યમાં માનપાન એટલું બધું સસતું થઇ ગયું છે કે, કોઈપણ અમલદાર કે અધીકારીથી, ઉપકારનાં દબાણમાં આવેલા આસામીઓ પ્રજાનાં નામથી તેને લેપડા લગાડવાને તતકાલ બાહાર પડી જાય છે. પ્રજાનાં નામથી ચેડાં કાઢવાની આવી ધોરણનો બને તેમ અટકાવ થવાની જરૂર છે. માનપાન કોને આપવું અને કોને નહીં તે હવે પ્રજા પોતે સમજતી થઈ છે, એટલે જેને માન આપવાની જરૂરજ હોયછે તેને તે આપવા વગર ચુકતી નથી. ખાનગી રીતે આવી હીલચાલ થતી હોય તેની સામા અમોને કે પ્રજાને કોઈ રીતનો વાંધો રહે નહીં; પણ, પ્રજા એક ચીજમાં દેખીતી વીરૂધ્ધ હોવા છતાં, તેનાં નામથી આ હીલચાલ કરવા માટે બાહર પડવાનાં કામને પ્રજા નાપસંદ કરવા વગર રહે નહીં.

કોઈ પણ ખાનગી હીલચાલ સામે ફરીયાદ કરવાને હમુને મુદ્દલ હક નથી, પણ જ્યારે ગણતરીના આસામીઓ પોતાને થયલા લાભના બદલામાં એક હાકમ, જેની કારકીરદી તદ્દન નીપજલ ઉતરી હોય, અને તેની પાંચ વરસની હકુમતના દરમયાનમાં પ્રજા તેનાં કામોથી નારાજ થયેલી હોય, તેજ એક હાકમને એવી જાહેર રીતે માત્ર અકરામ આપવાની હીલચાલની સામે હમારો નખલો અવાજ કાઢવાને હમો હમારી ફરજ સમજીએ છીએ. એ હાકમના કામોનો જે સરવાલો તપાસવામાં આવે તો, ખુદી રીતે નાપસંદ કામોનું પણ નમતુંજ માલમ પાડશે. આ સમજી સરજની રાશની જોઈને બોલું છતાં તેને જ્યારેત આપવાની હીલચાલ

એવી જાહેર રીતે કરવામાં આવે તો તેમાં લાગતાવલગતાઓએ કેટલી જુલુ કરી છે, તેની ઉપર હમો વાંચનારાઓનું ધ્યાન ખેંચવા માંગ્યે છીયે, ડાક્ટર બાહાધુરજીએ હીમતથી જે વીચારો જણાવ્યા હતા, તેની સાથે હમો એકમલતા થઇયે છીયે, અને તેમના જણાવ્યા પરમાણુ આ હીલ-ચાલ સાંકડી હૃદમાં રહીને, અને તેને જાહેર રૂપ આપવાની વેતરણુ કર્યા વગરજ કરવામાં આવી હતે તો તેની સામે ફરીયાદ ઉઠાવવાને કશું કારણ રહેતે નહીં.

ગઈ પરમ દીને મલેલી સભા એવી રીતે ધાન બગાડીને ઉડી છે. એથી જાણે એનું થાય છે કે પ્રજાને માનીતો થઇ પડનાર એક હાકમ અને અણુગમતો થઈ પડનાર હાકમ વચ્ચે કરો તફાવત રહેતો નથી, અને એક હાકમ રદ્યતને નાખુશ કરીને પાંચ પચાસ આદમીઓનો ખાર પોતાની તરફમાં ખેંચી લેવા પામે તો, તેને એક જાતની આશા રહે છે કે તેની હકુમતને છેડે તેના લાગતાવલગતાઓ તેને માન અકરામ આપશે અને તેના લંબાણુ રીપોરટો વરતમાનપતરોમાં પ્રગટ થવાથી, તે પોતાના જાત ભાઇઓને પોતાના વતનમાં બતલાવીને, આ મુલકના દેશી-ઓને ખોટા પાડવાને તે હીમત કરો શકે. એવીખી સંભાલ લાગતાવલગ-ઓએ રાખવી જોઇયે છે. એક તરફથી એવી રીતની હીલચાલ પસાર થઇ ચુકી છે અને બીજી તરફથી એક બીજી ચીઠી ગઇ પરમ દીને સાંજે બાહેર પડેલી હમારા જોવામાં આવી છે. એ ચીઠીના સંબંધમાં વધુ વીવેચન કરવા આગમ્ય તે સદાબરી હમો હેડે ઉતારી લઇયે છીઇયે, અને તેની નીચે જેઓએ સહીઓ કરી છે, તે જોતાં વાચનારી આલમને પોતાનું મત બાંધવાને બની આવશે. એ ચીઠી નીચે પરમાણુની છે:—નામ-દાર લારડ હેરીસ મુબંધના ગવરનરનો ઓધો છેડે, તયારે તેવણુની યો-ગ્ય યાદગારી રાખવા માટે શું પગલાંઓ ભરવાં, તે વીશે તકરાર કરી ઠેરાવ ઉપર આવવાને મયુનીસીપલ હોલમાં મંગલવાર તા. ૧૫ મી જા-નેવારી દીને સાંજના પાંચ કલાકે બોલાવેલી એક શુરૂઆતની સભામાં મેહેબાની કરી હાજર થશે:—મી. એચ. એ. એકવરથ, આનરેબલ મી. ફાઝલબાઇ વીસરામ, મી. જ્યોરજ કાટન, મી. હરકીસનદાસ નરોતમદા-સ, મી. એ. એફ. બોક્સટ, અને આનરેબલ મી. નવરોજજી નશરવા-નજી વહાડયા. જોવાનું રહે છે કે, એ નોતરાંને માન આપીને કેટલા ગ-રહસ્યો એ સભામાં હાજર થાય છે. મયુનીસીપાલીટીનો હોલ જખરદસંત અને તેની સાથે મયુનીસીપાલીટીની આશીસ પડોસમાં એંડેસે મી. એક-



વરધની શરમને લીધે, તેના હાથ હેઠલના સપલા જણુ આ સભામાં હા-  
જર થશે અને એને લીધે એ સભાને મોટું રૂપ આપવાને બની આવશે.  
એવો ઉમદો વીચાર સપલાઓને સુઝ પડે નહીં. પણ આવી હીલચા-  
લોથી પરજ ઠગાય નહીં, તે માટેની સભાલ રાખવાની ઘણીજ જરૂર  
છે, અને એને ખાતરજ હમો તેઓને એની સામે સાવચેતી બરેલા રા-  
ખવાને હમારી ફરજ સમજ્યે છીએ.

તા. ૯ મી જાનેવારી ૧૮૯૫.

## ૨

ગવરનર સાહેબ લારડ હેરીસ આપણને છેલી સલામ કરી જાય,  
તેની આગમ્ય તે નામદારે કરેલી સેવાની પીછાણુ તો થવીજ જોઈએ,  
એ તો આજ કાલનો ચાલુ આવેશો રેવાજ છે, અને એ રેવાજ ઉપર  
અમલ તો થવોજ જોઈએ. ગવરનર સાહેબ માન અકરામ વગર વીદાય  
થાય, તે કાંઈ મુ'બઈને શોભા આપનાર કહેવાય નહીં અને મુ'બઈનું નાક  
કપાઈ નહીં જાય ? એવા મુ'બઈમાં નરો છે, અને તેઓ હમેશાં એ માટે  
એક પગે થઈ રહે છે, તે જોઈને મને આનંદ ઉપજે છે. સારું થયું કે,  
મુ'બઈની આંઠ લાખની વસતીમાં ગણતરીના પીસતાલીસ માણસો છે, કે  
જેઓએ આજે મુ'બઈનું નાક રાખ્યું છે ? એ લોકો નહીં હોતે તો, આજે  
મુ'બઈને કેટલું શરમાતું પડતે ? ધન છે તે પીસતાલીસ જણુને, અને  
તેના સંબંધમાં મને વીશેષ ખુશાલી એટલા ઉપરથી ઉપજે છે કે એ  
પીસતાલીસ જણુમાં એકવીસ તો પારસીઓ છે. પારસીઓની બેલબાલા ?  
જ્યાં હોય ત્યાં તેઓ પેહેલા ? કદી પછાત નહીં ? હમેશાં તેઓના પગલાં  
રૂડાં ? આજે પારસીઓની મોટી સંખ્યાનો ખોલ લારડ હેરીસે પોતાની  
તરફેણમાં ખેંચી લીધો, પણ આ વીસ જનની હાજરી બતલાવી નથી  
આપતી કે, પારસીઓમાં જે ડાહ્યા પુરો છે, તે આ એકવીસ જણુ છે,  
અને તેઓ એવા બધા ગવરનરે કરેલી સેવાની, કેવી કદર જુએ છે ?  
ધનય છે, એ એકવીસ પારસીઓને ?

..... લારડ હેરીસને છુપાઈત આપવા માટે તેના મીતરોની સભા બોલાવી  
હતી, તેમાં બે પારસીઓ અને એક હીંદુએ હાજર થઈને સંભાના કામકાજ  
સામે પોતાનો અનગમો બતલાવ્યો હતો. 'હું ધારું છું' કે, તેઓને કંઈ  
કાંઈ ધંધો નહીં હશે; તેથી પોતાનો વખત બાલવાને એ મહેલી સભામાં

હાજર થયા હશે ! ડાકટર બાહાદુરજીએ ખરેખર બાહાદુરી બતલાવી એની સામે પોતાનો અનગમો જાહેર કર્યો, અને મીઠા પટેલે જો સમાના સર- નશીનનું ધ્યાન ખેંચ્યું નહીં હતો તો, ખોદા જાણે તેવણુ કેટલું ખડું આડું અવલું વેતરી દેતો. પણ સરનશીને તેનો ટુકમાં અટકાવ કર્યો તે ઠીક, નહીં તો ખીજાઓ ડાકટર બાહાદુરજીનો દાખલો પકડવાને બાહાદુર થતો. અરે જલા માણસો, તમુને એ કામ પસંદ નહીં એટલે સભામાં હાજરી આપવાની જરૂર નથી ? જંગના મેદાનમાં ઉતરીને હાથમાં ખેટ લાઇને દોડાદોડ કરવી, તેમજ દાવ આપતી વખતે મેદાનમાં દોડવું, એ કામ કંઈ બધાથી અને કે ? કદી નહીં ? ગવરનર સાહેબે તે કરી બત- લાવ્યું, ત્યારે તેનો બદલો શું મલવો જોઈતો નથી ? જ્યાંફતમાં શું વલ્યું ? એવા શુરા નરનું તો આવલું જોઈએ, અને જે પીસતાલીસ જણુ બાહર પડ્યા હતા, તેઓને લાજમ છે કે, એ નરનું તો આવલુંજ ઉભું કરવું, અને લોકોની હસીની કશી દરકાર કરવી નહીં !

બ્યાફતનું હમઅંગ થઈ ચુકું કે, ખીજ છ યુનંદા નરો બાહર પડ્યા છે. આ છ નરમાં ફક્ત એકજ પારસી, એકજ હીંદુ, એકજ મોહમેદન, અને તરણુ યુરોપયનો છે, અને તેઓમાં આપણા રોહિરના મયુનીસીપલ કમીશનર વડા છે. તેઓએ એક ચીડી લખાને પુછાવ્યું છે કે, લારડ હેરીસ હાકમી છોડી જાય, તેની આગમય તે નામદારની યાદગારી કાયમ રાખવા માટે કેવાં પગલાં ભરવાં, તે ઉપર વીચાર કરવાને આવતા મંગલવારે મલનારી સભામાં તમો મેહેરબાની કરી હાજર થશો ? હવે આ છ જણુમાં તરણુ યુરોપયનો તેઓ ગુજરાતી ભાશા શું જાણી શકે ? એમાં મેહેરબાની શાની ! એતો ફરજ છે, અને એ ફરજ બજાવવાને બાહર પડવામાં મેહેરબાની શાની જોઈએ ? મારી નજરમાં તો એ એક જાતની બાજુ રમાઈ છે, અને આ બાજુગરોમાં પેલા એકાદ બે એવા નરો છે કે જેઓએ લારડ હેરીસના આવલાં માટે દેશી રાજાઓમાં સર- કચુલર ફેરવ્યાં હતાં. દેશી છાપો કહે છે કે, એ ગોઠવણુ નીશફલ ગઈ, પણ તેઓ હવે જોશે કે, નીશફલ ગઈ નથી, પણ તે છાનીમાની આગલ વધી છે, અને હાલમાં તેનો લાભ લેવાને પેલા નરો ખીજ રૂપે બાહર પડ્યા છે. હું તો તેઓને અંતઃકરણથી ફતેહ ઈછુંછું, બાકી આલમની શી ચરવા છે !

હારડ હેરીસે નાસક જવાનો કંઈ વીચાર માંડી વાલ્યો નથી. એકાદ બે દીવસમાં તે નામદાર ત્યાં સીધારનાર છે, અને આવતા સોમવારને દીને તેમાં આવેલી પવીતર નદી ગોદાવરી ઉપર જે પુલ બાંધવામાં આવનાર છે, તેનો પાયો નાખવાની ઠીરીયા કરનાર છે. ત્યાંની મયુનીસીપાલીટીએ એ કામ કરવા માટે હારડ હેરીસને આજીજી કરી, એટલે તેનાથી એ નોતર નામજુર રાખી શકાયું નહીં. બાકી તેવણુ ત્યાં જવાને ક્યાં બેસી રહ્યા હતા. પોતાની હકુમત તલેના મુલકમાં તેવણુ છેક દક્ષીણથી ઊતર મુધી ફરી વળ્યા હતા, પણ માઠા ભાયગે નાસક તરફ જવાને તેવણુને ટક મૂલી નહીં હતી, તેથી એ ટક હાથમાં લેવાને સોના મોહર જેવું થયું. એક તો પવીતર ગોદાવરી માતાના દરશન થશે, અને બીજું તો ત્યાંની મયુનીસીપાલીટીનું માનપતર મલશે ! આ ટકનો લાભ લઈને જો ચવલાના હુલડખોરોને બે શીખામણુ તેવણુ દેતા આવે તો ઠીક ! એવી સરસ ટક હાથમાં કદી આવનાર નથી, અને શીખામણુની સાથે બે સોટી લગાડવાને બી ચુકું નહીં, કે તેઓ એ નામદારને યાદ રાખવાને પછાત પડે નહીં. અમદનગર અને સોલાપુર ખાતે એ નામદારે કરેલાં બાશણોથી હોંદુઓને ઘણું લાગે છે, અને તેવા સમયે જરા તેઓની ઝાટકણી પાછી નાશકમાં કાઢવાથી ઝોર લાભજ થશે, અને તેમાં સેવટે પ્રાયદો થશે ?

પુણાના બરાહમણોને હારડ હેરીસ સાથે સખત ગરહણુ લાગેલું માલમ પડે છે. અને તે કદી છુટે એવું લાગતું નથી. હારડ હેરીસ પોતાની હકુમત લેઈ પુણે આવતાંજ પુણાના બરાહમણો સાથે પેહેલું ગરહણુ લાગ્યું હતું. તેઓએ એ નામદારને માનપતર અરપણુ કરવાની પરવાનગી લઈને પાછલથી તે આપવાના અખાડા કરી ગયા. એ પછી તેઓ વચે અનેક પરકારના ગરહણો લાગ્યાં હતાં, અને તેમાં છેલા હુલડ વખતનું ગરહણુ ખડું ભારે હતું. એને લીધેજ ધારૂ બાંધનારી સભામાં એક પરતીનીધી મોકલવાનો હક એ ગવરનરે મધ્ય વીભાગને આપ્યો નહીં ? એતો ઠીક કર્યું, નહીતો ખોદા બાણે તેઓ શું કરી મેલતે ? હાલમાં એ બરાહમણોએ નવી બાજી માંડી હતી, પણ ગવરનર સાહેબ તે તુરતજ સમજી ગયા, અને એ ટકનો લાભ લઈને વીઢાય થતી વખતે પાછો એક વધુ ફટકો મારવાને બહાર પડ્યા છે. ૧૮૬૦ માં માજી ગવરનર હારડ રેને નામનું એક મધુક્રયમ બાંધવાને તેઓએ તુરતાતુરત રૂપયા સતર હજારની રકમ ભરી નાખી અને સરકાર પાસેથી બેંચતી જગા લેવા પછી, વરસ જતાં

એને લગતું ફંડ વધવાને બદલે સામું થઈ મર્યું ? રૂપયા સત્તર હજારની રકમ થઈને રૂપયા ચાર હજારની થઈ, અને બીજા રૂપયા એ હજારની ઉધરાણી ખતલાવી ?

ગવરનર સાહેબ અજબ થઈ ગયા, અને તેમાં નવાઈ શી ? સરવને આ વાત અજબખીમાં નાખે એવી હતી. સરકારે તેઓને એના મકાન માટે જે જગા આપી હતી, તે આ બ્રાહ્મણોએ મફત પચાવી જવા માંગતા હતા, પણ સરકારે તેના રૂપયા અગીયાર હજાર માંગ્યા ? લાગતાવલગતાઓને એ જગા મોઢી પડી ? લખાણુ વખતસર કાગલપતરોને વેહેવાર ચાલતાં એને લગતી જગા ફેરવી નાખવામાં આવી ! આઠ માસની વાત ઉપર એને લગતી કમીટીના સેક્રેટરી પાસેથી નાણું થઈ જવા માટેનો ખુલાસો માંગ્યો, પણ આ સેક્રેટરી મીં નામ જોશીએ તે વાતને ઉડાવવા કીધી, અને કશે ઉતર મોકલ્યો નહીં. કેલવણી ખાતાના વડાએ કંટાળીને સરકારને લખી વાલ્યું કે, એ ખુલાસો મલવાની કશી આશા નથી, એટલે ગવરનર સાહેબે ઝટ એક ટેરાવ બાહર પાડીને આ નામ જોશીને ઉંધાડે પાડીને આવતી તા. ૧૦ મી ફેબ્રુઆરી સુધીમાં એનો મનમાંગતો ખુલાસો નહીં આપે, અથવા તો રૂપયા વીસ હજારની રકમ સરકારી તીજોરીમાં નહીં ભરે તો, સરકારે પોતાની મદદ પાછી ખેંચી લેવાની ધમકી આપી છે. લાગતાવલગતાઓ એને ખાલી ધમકી સમજતા હશે, પણ તેમાં તેઓની એટલી ભુલ છે. લારડ હેરીસ અતરેથી વીદાય થવા આગમ્ય એના સંબંધમાં કંઈ નવું જીવું કરવાનો ઇરાદો રાખે છે, એવું માર્શ મત છે. D. તા. ૧૨ મી જાન્યુઆરી સને ૧૮૯૫.

### ૩

વીદાય થતા ગવરનર લારડ હેરીસની યાદગારી કાયમ રાખવા માટે તેના મીતરો અને વખાણુનારાઓની મલેલી સભા ઉપરથી ઉપજતા વીચારો.

મુખ્ય ઈલાકા ઉપર પાંચ વરસની હકુમત બોગવવા પછી લારડ હેરીસના મીતરો અને વખાણુનારાઓની એક સભા તે નામદારે આ ઇલા-

કાને કરેલી સેવાની કદર યુજવા માટે, ગમ્મ પરમ દીને સાંજના ટાઉન હાલમાં મળી હતી. એ સભાના કામકાજમાં ભાગ લેવા માટે જેઓ મોટી સંખ્યામાં હાજર થયા હતા, તેઓનો મોટો ભાગ મુ'બઈનો ગવર્નર કોણુ છે, તેનું નામ વતીક જાણુતા નહી હશે, અને તે છતાં તેઓને ત્યાં એ નામદારના મીતરો અને વખાણુનારાઓ તરીકે હાજર કરવાની ગોઠવણુ કરવામાં આવી હતી. તેઓ અંગરેજી ભાશા જાણુવાથી બેનશીબ માલમ પડતા હતા, અને તેઓ એ નામદારના મીતરો અને વખાણુનારાઓ થવાનો ફાંકો રાખે, એજ લગાર શક બરેલુ' હમુને લાગે છે. એ છતાં એ મલેલી સભા માટે કેટલાક આસામીઓ અને પતરવાલાઓ પોતાનો સંતોશ જાહેર કરે છે, અને તે માટે આપણે કશો વાંધો લઈશું નહી, પણ આજ સુધી મલેલી જાહેર સભામાં કેવા પરકારના ગરહસયો અને આસામીઓ ભાગ લેતા આવયા છે, તે તરફ જોતાં એ સભાને પ્રકત ચોક્કસ લાગતા-વલગતાઓએ જેમ અને તેમ મોટું રૂપ આપવાની જે વેતરણુ કરી હતી, તેમાં તેઓ ફતેહ પામયા છે, તે માટે હમો તેઓને મુબારકઆદી આપશું, પણ જાહેરમાં લોકોએ એ સભા માટે જે મત બાંધ્યું છે, તે આ લાગતાવલગતાઓને મુદ્દલ સોભા આપનારું ગણી શકાશે નહીં. અતરેના અંગરેજી પતરો પોતે એને લગતી હીલચાલને ટેકો આપતા આવયા છે, પણ બ્યારે એવું એક પતર નીચે પ્રમાણેનું પોતાનું મત એ સભાના સંબંધમાં આપે છે, ત્યારે લોકો એના સંબંધમાં શું મત આપશે? તે પતરવાલો લખે છે કે, મુ'બઈમાં જેટલા યુરોપયનો છે, તેના પ્રમાણમાં તેઓ એ સભામાં હાજર થયા નહી, તેનું કારણુ એ છે કે મુ'બઈના યુરોપયનો લારડ હેરીસને પોતાના વતન ખાતે ઉપડી જવાને જે થોડા દીવસનો વીલંબ છે તે અરસામાં તેઓ એ નામદારને કેટલીક જીયાદતો આપનાર છે એ બોલવું કેટલું વજનદાર છે તે બાબે હમો હવે પછી બોલશું, પણ એ તો ખુલી રીતે બતલાવી આપે છે કે, લારડ હેરીસ બાબે એ કામવાલાઓ ગમે તેવું સાદ મત ધરાવતા હોય તો જી એ નામદારના સંબંધમાં જે હીલચાલ બતલાવવાની વેતરણુ થઈ હતી તે તેઓ પોતે પસંદ કરતા નહી હશે. એ કામવાલાઓ એ નામદારને પોતાના એક જાતબાઈ તરીકે માન આપવાને ગમે તેટલા આતુર હોય તેની સામે હમુને કશો વાંધો નથી, પણ આ એક ખુદરતી સવાલ ઉભો થાય છે કે એ કામવાલાઓ બ્યારે લારડ હેરીસને એટલું બધું માન આપવાને કાલજ ધરાવતા હોય તો, એ નામદારના મીતરો અને વખાણુનારાઓ એના

સંબંધની હીલચાલને જાહેર રૂપ આપવાને પોતાથી બનતું કરતા હોય, તે વખતે એ કામવાલાઓ એમાં મોટો ભાગ લેવાને કદી પછાત પડતે નહીં. તેઓની ગેરહાજરી એટલું જ બતલાવી આપે છે કે, તેઓ એ કામ તરફ પોતાની નાપસંદગી બતલાવવા માંગતા હોય અથવા તો એ સભા ભેગી કરવાને જે હીલચાલ કરવામાં આવી હતી, તે તેઓને પસંદ નહીં હોય. આ બેમાંનું ગમે તે કારણ હોય. પણ જ્યારે એક અંગ્રેજી પત્રવાલો પોતાના એવા વીચારો જાહેરમાં જણાવવાને દરસ્ત વીચારે ત્યારે તેમાં મોટો ભરમ સમાયલો હોવો જોઈએ છે.

વક્ત્રી એ ભેગી મલેલી સભામાં લારડ હેરીસના મીતરો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ભેગા થયા હતા, અને આ સભાનું કામકાજ જેમ અને તેમ લખાવવાની વેતરણ કરી હતી, તે તેઓએ વખોડી નાખેલી જોઈને હમે અજાયબ થયા છઈએ. લારડ હેરીસની સત્વૃત્તી એ સભામાં ભાશણ કરનારાઓએ જેમ અને તેમ તાણીતોડીને કરી હતી, અને તેમ કરવા જતાં ગણતરીના તરણ ચાર ગુણો, જે દરેક ગરહસંધના સંબંધમાં જોવામાં આવે છે, તેની ઉપર તેઓએ લખાણ પીળન કર્યું હતું. એની સામે એજ નામદારના મીતરો અને વખાણુનારાઓએ પોતાની નાપસંદગી બતલાવી હતી, તેનો દાખલો અતરેની સમાલ કાઝ કોરટના ચોથા જડજ મીં હોરમજજ દાદાભાઈના સંબંધમાં બન્યો હતો. આગમચથી તઈયાર કરેલું ભાશણ ઘણીજ અસરકારક રીતે કરવા જતાં તેવણની સામે સભાસદોએ પોતાની નાપસંદગી બતલાવી હતી. એ છતાં મીં હોરમજજએ પોતાનું ભાશણ ચાલુ રાખવાની વેતરણ કરવા જતાં સભાએ પોતાની સત્વૃત્તી ખોડી દીધી હતી, અને તેની સામે પોતાનો મજબુત અનગમો બતલાવવાથી એવણને એસી જવાની ડરજ પડી હતી.

હમે તો ધારતા હતા કે, લારડ હેરીસના સંબંધમાં એવી રીતે ભરાતાં પગલાં સામે જ્યારે લગભગ આખી પરખ છે, ત્યારે તે નામદારના લાગતાવલગતાઓ અને મોટું રૂપ નહીં આપતાં, એ બાબત જેમ અને તેમ ટુંકમાં પતાવી દેશે. પણ એથી ઉલટું જ્યારે તે નામદારના મીતરો અને વખાણુનારાઓ તેને મોટું રૂપ આપવા જતાં તેની સામે સભાસદોએ પોતાનો અણગમો જાહેરમાં બતલાવવાથી એ કામ ઠીકજ થયું છે. મીં જયોરજ કાટને ભાશણ કરતાં જે વીચારો જણાવવા હતા, તેમાં લારડ હેરીસ બાબે જે કંઈ સ્તુતી કરવી ઘટે, તે સમજી તેમાં સમાઈ ગયું હતું, એટલે એ પ્રછીના બોલનારાઓ મોટું વધુ સ્તુતી કરવાને બાકી રહ્યું નહીં હતું. એ

જતાં જ્યારે બોલનારાઓ, જેઓને કંઈને કંઈ લાભ લારડ હેરીસના હાથે ચમા' છે તે માટે પોતાની ઉપર થયલાં હેસાન વાલી આપવા માટે એ બાબે લાંબા બાશણો કરવા જતાં સભાસદોએ તે તરફ અનુગમો બતાવવો હતો અને તેમાં તેઓ ખરેખર વાનખી હતા, એજ સભાની નીશફલતા બતાવવાની આપવાને પુરતું છે. સભામાં બોલાયલી સરવ વીગતોનો રદ્યો આપવાને અમો જેકે શક્તીવાન છધ્યે, પણ તેમ કરવાથી તે વાંચનારાઓને પસંદ નહીં પડવા સાથે તે સભ્યતાથી ઉલટું ગણી શકાય. તેથી અમો તે સંબંધો રદ્યો અતરે આપવાની અગત્યતા જોતા નથી. પણ બે તરણુ ગરહસયોએ લંબાણુ બાશણો કરીને જે માન લારડ હેરીસને આપવાની વેતરણુ કરી છે, તે બાબે જે અમો ચુપ રહ્યે તો, હમોએ અમારી ફરજ બજાવેલી ગણાય નહીં, તેથી તે દુકમાં જાહેરમાં મેલવાની હમો અમારી ફરજ સમજ્યે છીયે. દેશી રાજાઓ અને સરદારોનો ઘણો માનીતો લારડ હેરીસ છે, એવું સભામાં મેલવામાં આવ્યું હતું, અને તેને લીધે આ રાજાઓએ એ નામદારની યાદગારી રાખવાના ફૂંડમાં રૂપયા ૨૬૦૦૦ની મોટી રકમ ભરી છે આ સરદારો અને રાજાઓ તરફથી ભરાયલી રૂપયા ૨૬૦૦૦ ની રકમ મોટી માલમ પડે છે, પણ અમો એના સંબંધમાં જાણવા માગ્યે છીયે કે, એ રકમ ભરાવના માટે કોઇખી જાતનું દબાણુ કરવામાં આવ્યું હતું કે નહીં ? આજ સુધી એવા તાંકણે ઉભાં થયલાં ફૂંડોમાં દેશી રાજાઓ અને સરદારોએ કેઇ વખતે નાણાં ભરવાને ના પાડ્યું છે, અને પોતાની ઉપર હકુમત ચલાવનારા અમલદારોને કોઇખી રીતે ખુશી કરવાની કોશિશમાં તેઓ પછાત પડ્યા છે. એનેજ લીધે યા તો તેઓ ઉપર આડકતરું દબાણુ કરીને એ નાણાની રકમ કેમ નહીં ભેગી થઇ હોય તે વાત કોઇ હીમતથી ના પાડી શકશે ? વલી લારડ હેરીસ છેલો ગુજરાત અને કાઠ્યાવાડના પરવાસે ગયો, ત્યારે તયાંના રાજાઓ અને સરદારોમાં એ માટે નાણાં મેલવવાને કાંય અરજ કરવામાં આવી હતી, અને એ નામદારના મીતરો અને વખાણુનારાઓએ તેઓ પાસેથી નાણાં કહડાવવાને કાંય તેજ વખત પસંદ કર્યો હતો ? તેનો કંઈ તેઓ ખુલાસો આપી શકશે ? એજ બતાવવાની આપે છે કે, દેશી રાજાઓ અને સરદારો પાસેથી કેવી રીતે એ નાણાં કહડાવવામાં આવ્યાં હતાં. વલી છેલા પરવાસની વખતે લારડ હેરીસને જે જે માનપત્રો અને માનઅક્રામ મલ્યાં હતાં, તેના સંબંધમાં સુવર્ણના માણી શીરીફ ડાક્ટર કાવસજી હોરમજીએ ઈસાફે કરતાં આ ઈલાકાના લોકો તે નામદારના કેદલા આભારી થયા છે, તેથી

થાક આપી હતી. હવે એ બાબત એ પડતી નાખવામાં આવતે તો, તેવી સામે કાંઈને વાંધો નથી. ડાક્ટર કાવસજી સારીકાની જાણે છે કે, લારડ હેરીસ નામદાર બહારાણીજના એક પરતીનીધી તરીકે આપણા ઈલાકાની હાકમી કરી છે, અને દરેક વફાદાર રઈયતની ફરજ છે કે, નામદાર મહારાણીજના પરતીનીધી તરીકે તેની તરફ વફાદારી બતલાવવી જોઈએ છે. એવા એક પરતીનીધીને પોતાના મુલકમાં કે શેહેરમાં આવતાં તે નામદારને આવકાર દેવાની ફરજ દરેક વફાદાર રઈયત સમજે છે, અને તેમ સમજીને તેઓએ એ નામદારને માનઅકરામ કે માનપતરો આપ્યાં હોય તો પછી તે શું લારડ હેરીસ તરફની તેઓની મમતા બતલાવી આપે છે કે ? ડાક્ટર કાવસજી સારીકાની જાણે છે કે, મુદ્દસીલમાં એવાં માનપતરો તખ્તાર કરવામાં મોટા સરકારી અમલદારોના હાથ કેવા હોય છે, અને માનપતરોમાં મીઠું મીઠું પીરસવા સીવાય બીજું કંઈ કરવામાં આવતું નથી. વધી ડાક્ટર કાવસજી જાણુતા હશે કે સુરત, ભરૂચ, અમદાવાદ, વગેરેની મયુનીસીપાલિટીઓ એ નામદારને માનપતરો આપવા માટે જે ખર્ચો કરવા નીકળી હતી, તેનો અટકાવ કરવા માટે આ શેહેરોના કેટલાક સવ-તંતર આસામીઓએ ત્યાંની કોરટોનો આસરો લીધો હતો, અને ફક્ત ધારાની ખામીને લીધે તેઓને માંગેલી દાદ મળી શકી નહીં હતી. એવો ખનાવ આ ઈલાકાના ઇતિહાસમાં પેહલો ખનયો હતો; અને જોકે અમે પોતે તે પસંદ કરતા નથી તોપણ લારડ હેરીસ તરફ દેશાવરના લોકોની બધી લાગણી કેટલી છે, તેનો સરસ દાખલો એ કરતાં મળી શકનાર નથી. એટલા માટે જો એ બાબતને છોડવામાં આવી નહીં હોત તો, એ બાબે તેની વીરૂધ્ધમાં આ ટકે વીચાર જણાવવાની અમુને ફરજ પડતે નહીં. એવી રીતે જાહેરમાં એ બાબત પાછી લાવવા માટે અમે ખરેખર દલગીર છીએ, પણ દમારી ફરજ બળવતાં એ બાબત એક વાર પાછી બાહર લાવવાને અમે દરસત વીચાર્યું છે. વધી કેટલાક બોલનારાઓ તો બોલતી વખતે એટલા બધા દોરવાઈ ગયા હતા કે તેઓએ ઇંગ્લંડની સરકારને વીનંતી કરી હતી કે લારડ હેરીસ જેવા ગવર્નર મોકલી આપવાની ઉદારતા દેખાડવી અને એવા ગવર્નરને આ દેશના લોકો વધારે પસંદ કરશે. એ બોલવામાં કેટલી શહરામત છે, તેની મુનસૂખી હમે દમારૂ વાંચનારાઓને શોંપ્યે છીએ. જે કોઈપણ ગવર્નર આવે સુધી રઈયતને ખચ મેલવવાને નીશદ્દ બચો હોય તો તે લારડ હેરીસ છે. તેના કામથી કોઈપણ કામના લોકોને સંતોશ મળ્યો નથી, અને લોકો તે જાહેરમાં



જાણાવવાને પછાત પડ્યા નથી. કેલવાયલા લોકો એ સભાના કામકાજમાં ભાગ લેવાથી અલગ રહ્યા છે, તેજ દાખલો કેલવણીના કામને એ નામદાર તરફથી મહેલાં ઉતેજનનો પુરતો દાખલો છે. આપણી યુનીવરસીટીને સરકાર તરફથી દર વરસે મલતી રકમ બંધ પાડવાને લારડ હેરીસની સરકારે 'ખુલેખુલું' જણાવ્યું હતું, અને તેને લીધે એ યુનીવરસીટીની જુદી જુદી પરીક્ષાઓમાં હાજર થતા ઊમેદવારો પાસેથી જે લવાજમ લેવામાં આવતો હતો તે એજ હાકેમના વખતમાં વધારવો પડ્યો છે. કેલવણીના સંબંધમાં એ નામદારને ઉતેજન આપવાનો ઉત્તમ દાખલો એ કરતાં આપણને બીજો કોઈ મલી શકશે નહીં. પોલીસના ખરચ બાબે એ નામદારની સરકાર સાથે આપણી મયુનીસીપાલીટીને પડેલો વાંધો આપણે સારીકાની જાણ્યે છીએ, અને એ નામદારે વીદાય થતી વખતે પોલીસનો વધુ ખરચ મયુનીસીપાલીટી ઉપર રૂપયા ૨,૭૪,૪૮૬ નો નાખ્યો છે. એવી સેવા એ નામદારે આપણા શહેરને કરી છે, અને તેને લીધે એ નામદાર લોકોને વધારે અનગમતો થઈ પડે, તેમાં નવાઈ કંઈ નથી.

તા. ૩૧ મી જાનેવારી સને ૧૮૯૫.

૪

**વીદાય થતા ગવરનર લારડ હેરીસના સંબંધમાં વીરૂધ્ધ  
પક્ષવાલાઓએ ભરવા માંડેલાં પગલાંઓ.**



લારડ હેરીસના મીતરો અને વખાણનારાઓએ એક સભા ગયા મંગલવારને દીને સાંજના અતરેની ટાઉનહાલવાલા મકાનમાં ભરીને પોતાનું કામ કરીને પરવારી ગયા છે. ત્યારેજ હમોએ બય ખતલાવી હતી, કે, એમ કરીને તેઓએ વીરૂધ્ધ પક્ષને ઘણું મજબુત કરણ આપ્યું છે. હદની અંદર રહીને વરતવાને બદલે તે કુદાવી જવાથી વીરૂધ્ધ પક્ષવાલાઓ એની વીરૂધ્ધમાં પગલાંઓ ભરવાને જે ધચુપચુ હતાં, તેઓને મજબુતાઈ આવી છે. એ ખાટેની હમારી આગાહી ખરી પડી છે, અને વીરૂધ્ધ પક્ષવાલાઓ એના સંબંધમાં શું પગલાં ભરવા તે બાબે વીચાર કરવાને આજે

સાંજના સવાયાંચ વાગે પરેસીડનસીવાલાના મકાનમાં ભેગા થનાર છે. એના સંબંધમાં નીકલેલી ચીઠીઓ હમારા જોવામાં આવી છે, અને લોકોની લાગણી તરફ જોતાં એને લગતું કામ ફતેહમંદી સાથે પાર પડવાની વકી રહે છે.

હારડ હેરીસના મીતરો અને વખાણનારાઓ ટાઝિનહાલમાં ભરાયલી સભામાં થયલા ઠેરાવોના સંબંધમાં હદ કુદાવી ગયલા હમો જોઈએ છે. એ સભાના સરનશીને માંગવાથી, સભા જે એકતરફી હતી, તેઓએ તેના સરનશીનને એ સભામાં પસાર થયલા બે ઠેરાવો નામદાર હારડ હેરીસની જાણમાં લાવવાની પરવાનગી આપી હતી. એની રૂએ એ સભાના સરનશીને એ ઠેરાવોની નકલ એ નામદાર ઊપર મોકલી આપવાને બદલે એક ડેપ્યુટેશનના આકારમાં એ સભાનો સરનશીન કેટલાક જણોને લઈને હારડ હેરીસને ગદ્દ કાલ દીને સેક્રેટરીયેટના કાઉનસીલ હાલમાં ગયો હતો. ત્યાં વહી એ ઠેરાવોની નકલ મુગે મોહડે આપવાને બદલે ત્યાં ભાશણો થયાં હતાં, અને તેનો ઉત્તર હારડ હેરીસે આપ્યો હતો. એ વાત બાહર આવવાથી વીરૂધ્ધ પક્ષવાલાઓને એની સામે મજબુત પગલાં ભરવાને બન્યું છે, અને તેનેજ લીધે આજે પરેસીડનસી હાલમાં એક સભા બોલાવી છે. એ સભા કેવી વલાણુ લે છે, તે આજે નકી કરવામાં આવશે, અને જે જરૂર જણાશે તો એના સંબંધમાં એક જાહેર સભા બોલાવવાની ગોઠવણુ કરવામાં આવશે. એના સંબંધમાં હમો હાલમાં કશું બોલવા માંગતા નથી, પણ એટલું જણાવવા વગર ચાલતું નથી કે એવાં પગલાં વીરૂધ્ધ પક્ષવાલાઓ ભરવાને તદ્દનજ વાજબી છે, સખબ કે ટાઝિનહાલમાં ભરાયલી સભાએ ધણું અતેરું કરી મેલ્યું હતું, અને વીરૂધ્ધ પક્ષવાલાઓને અર્થઃ મજબુતાઈ કરી આપી છે.

તા. ૨ જી ફેબ્રુઆરી સને ૧૮૯૫.



# THE RAST GOFTAR AND SATYA PRAKASH.



ગરીબ ખીચારા ગવરનર સાહેબ લાડ હારિસ ! ગરીબ ખીચારા તેમને “ચાહનારાઓ અને વખાણુનારાઓ !” એ નામદારને વિલાયત વળતી વખતે તેના વ્હાલા થઇને તેઓ અનેક તરાંહથી તેને માન આપવાનાં અનેક અવતિયાં મારે છે, પણ તેમાં નિષ્કૂળ અને નિષ્કૂળજ થતા જાય છે. નામદાર લાડ હારિસને સાઈ લગાડતા તો તેઓ ડોસા થયા પણ તે નામદારને તેઓ સામું માડું લગાડે છે અને તે નામદારની આભરને આજ ચહડાવે છે. “ખોદા ! મારા દોસ્તોથી મને ખચાવો !” એમ લાડ હારિસને કેહવાનું પુરતું કારણ મળે એવા તેમના આ “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” માલમ પડે છે અને તેમની ચાલ પણ તેવીજ નિવડતી જાય છે. છેલ્લામાં છેલ્લો બુદ્ધિ એ કાઢાડ્યો છે કે લાડ હારિસે ક્રિકેટ અને ખીજી રમતગમતોને બહુ વધારી આપી છે માટે સધળા ક્રિકેટરોએ અને રમતગમતોના તથા શેકારી શો-કિનોએ તે નામદારને ખાસ માન આપવું. પણ આમ કેહવા કરવાનો અર્થ શો ઉઠે છે તેનો લાડ હારિસના “ચાહનારાઓ તથા વખાણુનારાઓ” એ કાંઇ વિચાર કીધો વાઈ? લાડ હારિસના ફક્ત ક્રિકેટ અને રમતગમતોના શોખની પીછાણુ દેખાડવી એટલે કે એમજ ઠરવું કે ગવરનર દાખલ તે નામદારે ખીજી મોટા ગુણો—જાહેર પીછાણુ કરવા લાયકના ગુણો—જાણુકે કાંઈ દેખાડ્યાજ નહી હોય, અને તે નામદારને માનમાં માન ખાસ કરીને ખેલાડી દાખલજ થટે છે. લાડ હારિસના વિરૂધ ટીકાકારોએ તે નામદારને ફક્ત “એક ક્રિકેટર ગવરનર”નું માન આપ્યું છે તથા તે નામદારના “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” તે નામદારને માન આપવાનો એજ રસ્તો પકડીને તે વિરૂધ પક્ષના ટીકાકારોને ગોયા ખરા પાડે છે અને આ બાબતમાં તો દોસ્તો તથા દુશમનો સધળા એકલા એકલા એકા થાય એમ તેઓ આસે છે.

ત્યારે શું એક ગવરનરની કારકિર્દીમાંનાં એકેક નીરનીરાણાં કામને ચુંટી કાઢાડી તેને માટે ખાસ માન આપવું અને ખાસ યાદ જાળવવી ? એમ બીજા બધા ગુણોમાંથી એક ગુણ પસંદ કરીને તેની પિછાણ દેખાડવાથી તો નહિ કે બીજા બધા ગુણોની તેનામાં ગેરહાજરી ખામખા અને મોહડે ચઢીને સ્વિકારવાનો વાંધો ઉભો થાય છે, તે ઉપરાંત કેહવાનું છે કે લાર્ડ હારિસનાં “ ચાહનારાઓ અને વખાણનારાઓ ” એ ગવરનરો તથા બીજા જાહેર પુરૂષોને માન આપવાનો આ વળી એક નવો ધારો કાઢાડ્યો છે અને નવું ધોરણ સ્થાપ્યું છે. એ નવાં ધોરણ પ્રમાણે તો એક ગમે એવા અપ્રિય હાકમની પણ યાદગારી રાખી શકાશે, કાંકે એક જાહેર પુરૂષમાં સઘળાજ દુર્ગુણો હોય અને સદગુણો કાંઈજ નહીં હોય એવું તો કદી બનેજ નહીં માટે તેણે બીજાં ગમે એટલાં અણગમતાં કામોથી પ્રજાનો અભાવ મેળવ્યો હોય તોપણ તેનાં એકજ બધાં કામને જાહેરમાં પસંદ કરી તેને માન આપ્યું હોય એટલે બસ. તેના ગુણદોષની એ કાંઈ ખરી પિછાણ કેહવાય નહીં. એ તો દોષ સઘળા દરગુજર કરી તે ઉપર અખાડા કરવા સરખું થયું અને એક દોષવાન જાહેર પુરૂષને ગુણવાન દાખલ ચોકી બેસાડવાનું થયું. એ તો પ્રજાની અને અગત્ય કરી આવતા જમાનાની આંખોમાં ધુળ છાંટવા સરખું થયું. એ ધોરણ તો હવે પછીના હાકમોને ભુલાવે ખવાડનારું થયું, જેઓ ગમે એટલી દોષવાન કારકિર્દી વચ્ચે સમજશે કે સેવટે આપણી ખામીઓ માફ થશે અને આપણા એક બધા ગુણને માટે લોકો માને આપવા નિકળશેજ.

---

મદાનગીના શોખ અને મદાનગીબરેલા ગુણો લાર્ડ હારિસ જેવા એક હિંમતવાન મદદ બચ્ચાને શોભા લગાડે છે એ ખરું છે એ ગુણોને આપણા વચ્ચે ખીલવવાને લાર્ડ હારિસના જાતી દાખલાએ અને કામોએ ધણું કીધું છે એખી ખરું છે. પણ માત્ર એટલાનેજ માટે તે નામ દ્વારને ગવરનર દાખલ જાહેર માન આપવા જતાં એમના “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણનારાઓ ” એ કેવળ છકડ ખાધી છે. તેઓની બોલાવેલી સભા ભાગી નહીં પડી તો ફક્ત તુફાની દેખાવ કરીને છુટી પડી છે. કે જે વેળા સભાપતિ મી. સયાનીએ ડાક્ટર બાહદુરજી જેવા એક પ્રસિદ્ધ સભાસદને સાચું બોલતા હડકાટીને બેસાડી દેવા પડ્યા હતા. એક ગવરનર જેવા કીર્તિવાન પુરૂષને માન આપવાની સભામાં આવી બોલ્યાલે અને

લુકાની તકરારનો દેખાવ અને એ લારડ હારિસના દાખલામાં પેહેલીજવાર બન્યું છે. તે નામદારના ગુજરાતના છેલા પ્રવાસ વેળા તે નામદારને માન-પત્ર અને ખીજો જાહેર આવકાર દેવા એમના ગુજરાતી “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” મેદાન પડ્યા સારે સુરત અને ભરૂચના કોઈ માથાના ફેરાવનો તેની સામા થયા હતા અને ઇનસાફની અદાલત સુધી લડ્યા હતા, એવો બનાવ આગળ એક પણ ગવરનરના બાબમાં બન્યો નહીં હતો. એ સઘળા જાહેર અપજ્જશને માટે લારડ હારિસ પોતાના “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” નો પાડ માનશે કે જેઓએ તે નામદારને જાહેર માન આપવાની હીલચાલ માથે ઉઠાવવા આગમચજ એ નામદાર વિષે પ્રજ્ઞમત કેવું છે તેનો તોલ કરવો હતો અને વખત પ્રમાણે વાત કરવી હતી. તેઓએ તેવી તપાસ નહીં રાખી તેથી તેઓનેજ ભારી પડી ગયું અને એમને ભય છે કે હજી પણ લારડ હારિસના મુબઈના “ચાહનારા તથા વખાણુનારા” એને કાંઈ પણ અવીચારી પગળું ભારી પડી જશે.

મુબઈના ગવરનર દાખલની લારડ હારિસની કારકિર્દી લોકપ્રિય થઈ નથી એવો એકસ છે એ નામદાર સરખા એક સુધા અને ભોલા તથા ભડભડખોલા ખુલ્લાં દિલના હાકમને માટે એ ઘણી માઠા ભાગ્યની વાત છે અને તોપણ તે ખરી છે કે એ નામદારના છેલાં પાંચ વરષના અમલે પ્રજ્ઞને સંતોષ પમાડ્યો નથી. રાજખાઈ ટાવરવાળી ભયંકાર ખુન-રેજીના વખતથી લારડ હારિસની સરકારને હાથે પ્રજ્ઞનાં દિલને કારી જખમો લાગ્યાછે, જે હજી રજ વળ્યા નથી અને પુણાનાં હુલડ પછી તે અવશ્ય તાજ થયાં છે. કદાચ પ્રજ્ઞ ખોટીખી હોય અને લારડ હારિસનો તેમાં કાંઈજ દોષ નહીંખી હોય તોપણ વાત ખોટી નથી બોલ્યું અબોલ્યું થતું નથી. પ્રજ્ઞનો એ અલગમો અને અભાવ કાંઈ છુપ્યો નથી અને તે નામદારના પોતાનાં માન તથા મોભાને ખાતર આપણુ ઈચ્છીશું કે એ નામદારને “ચાહનારા તથા વખાણુનારાઓ” કાંઈ પણ જાહેર હીલચાલનું પગળું ભરવા અગાઉ પ્રજ્ઞના વેહતાં જગરોના એ તાતા ધા વિસારી નહીં દેય તો સાઈ. એક ઉસ્કેરાયલી પ્રજ્ઞના તાજ જખમોની તેઓ ઘટ્ટી કદર નહીં તો ચાહ રાખીને કામ લેશે તો સાઈ. નહીં તો કે પોતા સામેજ નહીં પણ જે માનવંત મહા પુરૂષને તેઓ માન આપવા માગેછે તે નામદારની સામે તેઓએ પ્રજ્ઞપોકારને છેડી મેળ્યોછે તે દુખિયાસે પ્રજ્ઞપોકાર કાંઈ વધારે મોટું અને ગંભીર રૂપ પકડશે, તેમ નહીં અને તેની તેઓ સંભાલ રાખે તો બહુ સાઈ.

મુબઈ, તા. ૧૩ મી જાનેવારી ૧૮૮૫,

ત્યારે હવે ગવરનર સાહેબના “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” તે નામદારનો ઘાણુ વાળી તો ઉઠ્યા ! એવા “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ”થી ખોદા પનાહ રાખે ! તેઓએ એક નાની શરૂઆતની સભામાં ઠરાવ કીધો કે નામદાર લાર્ડ હારિસની યાદગારી રાખવા માટે આવતી તા. ૨૬ મીને દિને જાહેર સભા ભરવી, મગર તે શેહરીઓની નહી, શેરીશની મારફતે સભા ખોલાવવી નહી, પણ માત્ર “દોસ્તો અને ચાહનારાઓ” ની એક ખાનગી સભા ખોલાવવી. કાં વાર ? શેહરીઓની જાહેર સભા કાં નહી ? અને વળી શેરીશની મારફતે કાં નહી ? એટલે કે લાર્ડ-હારિસના “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” કયુલ કરે છે અને ખીલે છે કે શેહરીઓની જાહેર સભા ભરવામાં જોખમ છે ! કાંઈ ધાસ્તી છે ! જાહેર સભામાં તો સધ-જાઓને આવવાનો હક છે, જેને ગમે તેને સામા થવાનો પણ હક છે, અને કોઈ સામે થાય તો તેને બેસાડી દેવાય નહી; પણ “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ”ની સભામાં તો સધજાઓએ આગમ્યથી એકમત થઈને આવવુંજ જોઈયે, તેમાં કોઈથી સામા થવાય નહી અને જો સામા થયા તો તેને સેજમાં બેસાડી દેવાય.

પણ ત્યારે શું મુખ્યની જાહેર પ્રજા કાંઈ ગવરનર સાહેબના “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” નથી કે જાહેર પ્રજાને આ સભામાંથી ખાતલ રાખવા માગી છે ? ઉપલા ઠરાવનો અર્થ તો એવોજ નિકળે છે કે આખી જાહેર પ્રજા કાંઈ લાર્ડ હારિસના “દોસ્તો અને ચાહનારાઓ” નથી. જો પ્રજાના લોકો તેવા હોત તો આખી પ્રજાને આ સભામાં દાખલ કરી હોત. પણ વળી જો પ્રજાના લોકો તે નામદારના “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” નથી તો શું તેઓ તે નામદારના કોઈ દુશ્મનો છે ? હા—લાર્ડ હારિસના “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” તેમજ કેહ છે, તેઓ શરૂઆતની સભામાં તેમજ ઠરાવી ઉઠ્યા છે ! તેઓ આખી પ્રજાની સભા ખોલાવતા નથી કાંકે તેઓની નજરમાં લાર્ડ હારિસ પ્રજાપ્રિય હાકમ નથી. લોકો કેહ છે કે લાર્ડ હારિસ લોકપ્રિય નથી. એ વાતને તે નામદારના “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” ઉપલો ઠરાવ કરીને ખરી પાડી આપે છે ! લાર્ડ હારિસ લોકપ્રિય નથી એમ લોકોજ કેહતા નથી, પણ તે નામદારના “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” પણ તેમજ કેહ છે ! આપણુ ફરીથી કહીશું કે ખોદા એવા દોસ્તોથી પનાહ રાખે !

અને વાઈ જાહેર સભા ભરવી નહી, શેરીફની મારફતે ભરવી નહી એવું કયા ગવરનરના આજ્ઞમાં બન્યું છે ? ગવરનર જેવા સર્વોપરી સત્તાધારીને માન આપવું હોય ત્યારે શેરીફ ઉપર રેક્રિવજશન કરી જાહેર સભા ભરીને તેમ કરવાનો ધારોજ ચાલતો આવેલો છે. માજી હાકમ લાર્ડ રે વિશે વટીક તેમજ બન્યું હતું. લાર્ડ રેને માન આપવાનો વિચાર કરવા માટે ટાઉનહાલમાં સધળા શેહરીઓની જાહેર સભાજ ભરવામાં આવી હતી. અને તેથી કેવા વખતમાં ? જ્યારે લાર્ડ રેની ભલી સ્વતંત્ર રાજનીતી ઉપરથી અને દેશી પ્રજાની વાજખી પક્ષમાં તે નામદારની લાયક વધાણ ઉપરથી હિંદી ઇંગ્લેન્ડે તથા ઈંગ્લેન્ડ પત્રો તેની સામા થયા હતા અને તે નામદારને બહુ ખુશ બોલતા હતા, તેવા વખતમાં વટીક લાર્ડ રેની યાદગારી જાળવવા સાઈ આખી પ્રજાની જાહેર સભા ભરવામાં આવી હતી, પણ તે નામદારની પછીના પેઢલાજ માદીવારેસ લાર્ડ હારિસના આજ્ઞમાં તે ચાલતો આવેલો ધારો આ પેઢલીજવાર તોડી નાખવામાં આવે છે અને તેથી કોણ તોડે છે ? તે નામદારના “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” જ તે તોડી નાખે છે. મેં ગયા રવિવારે લખ્યું છે તે મુજબ તે નામદારની યાદગારીને તેઓ સાઈ લગાડતા નથી, પણ સાચું માર્કુ લગાડે છે. એવા દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓથી ખોદા પનાહ રાખે !

“દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” તે કોણ ? ઉપરી શરૂઆતની સભામાં જરા નજર કરો, મારા મેહરબાન. તે “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ”ની સભા હતી અને તે કેવા માણસોની હતી ? તેઓ આખરદાર શેહરી સજ્જનો અને ગૃહસ્થો હતા ખરા પણ તે કેવા ? ગવરનર સાહેબના કાંઈને કાંઈ રીતે આભારી, ઓશીયાળાઓ, સસ્તું માન ખાટવા નિકળેલા શેઠિયામાં ખપવા માગનારા, માન ચાનના ડોળધાળુઓ, થોડાક ખોરિયા ખાપરિયાઓ, ખુશામતના ખોરીયાઓ, ગવરમેંટ હાઉસના કોઈ હજુરિયા હાથજેડુઓ, ઇંગ્લેન્ડે રાજ રાખનારા અને બડા સાહેબના બહાલા થનારાઓ તેઓ પોતાના “ગરીબપરવર” “બંદેનવાજ,” “ખોદાવંદ” સાહેબને તાણી તોડીને ખુણા ખટાળામાં માન આપવાનું હોય ત્યારે “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” નાં સગવડભરેલાં નામના એક ઓઠાં તલે પોતાને રજુ કરવાને શરૂઆત નથી, તેઓની ખરેખરી હાલત પિછાણવી હોય તો વાંચો બગાલની સિવિલ સર્વિસવાળા હાનરેબલ મી. એચ. જી. ક્રેને તેઓને આટો આપેલી નીચલી સર્ટિફિકેટ—

મીં નરમધી—અને વાછા ને બાહાદુરજી, ને ગોખલે ને ખારે, ને સેતલવડ ને ઝવેરીલાલ તો જાણે પોતાની મતલબ કઢાડવામાં નામુરાદ ને નાસીપાસ થયા તે માટે તેની સામે બખાલા 'ખારેયની ? તમે જાણે " કાનશીયનસ " પ્રમાણે કામ કરોય, ને તે લોક જાણે " કાનશીયનસ " બાજુએ મુકીને કામ કરેય, એમ કે, સાહેબ ?

ચાપુ—( છાતી કઢાડીને ) હા, હા, એક નહીં પણ દસ લાખ વખત હા !

મીં નરમધી—( ઘણાજ ગેરવીને ) બરાબર ! બરાબર ! હવે ત્યારે મારો ખાત્રી તો પકેપકી ને પુરેપુરીજ થઇ ચુકી ! ) એક આંખ કાણી કરીને ) સાહેબો, હમણા જે ચાપલુશી ને ખુસામતની ખાણ ખોદવા તમે મંડી ગીયાય તે કંઈ અંદરથી જાડી મતલબના હીરા નીકળ્યા કે નહીં ? બાપુ, દીકરાઓને ઠસાવી દેવાનો કંઈ " ચાનસ " છે કે નહીં ?

ખુસા—( બોહોનીપર આવી જઇને ) ચાનસ હસે ને નહીં હસે, તેમાં તુંને શું બા ? અમે છધ્યે ને અમારા દીકરા છે ! અમેને જે ઓધા આપે તે માટે શું તેની તરફ ઉપકારી ને નીમખહલાલ નહીં થધ્યે કે ? અમે કંઈ તમારા જેવા નચુણા ને નીમખહરામ નથી ! અમે તો જેનું ખાધ્યે તેનુંજ ગાધ્યે !

મીં નરમધી—હું સાહેબનાં મત સાથે બોલેબોલ મલતો ચાઉં છું કે સાહેબ જેનું ખાઓ છો તેનુંજ ગાઓ છો ને જેની ધંટીએ બેસીને દગ્ગા તેનાજ ગીત લલકારો છો !

તાં ૩ જ ફેબ્રુઆરી ૧૮૯૫.

૧૦

અરે તારું ભલું થાયરે, " કામન સેન્સ ! "

ગયા મંગળવારે ટાઉન હાલમાં લારડ હેરીસના દોસ્તો અને ચાહના-રાઓની જે સભા મળી હતી, તેમાં ચીફસચોપરાસ, માઅલુમીકસ અને મધની રેલારેલ ચાલી રહી હતી, પણ એકજ ઘીજની ઘણી મોટી ગેર-



હાજરી દીસ્તી હતી, અને તે “ કામન સેનસ ” ( સાદી સમજ ) ની હતી તે જો ગેરહાજર નહીં હોત તો, અમે માન્યે છીએ કે, એ સભાનાં કામથી પ્રભુ વચ્ચે જે કચવાટ પેદા થયો છે તે હસ્તીમાં આવવાજ પામત નહીં. પણ માઠાં બાયજો જેમ દખલના મરાહાનાં બેળમાંથી “ કામન સેનસ ” કુદે ગેબ થઇ ગઈ છે, તેમ લાડ હેરીસના દોસ્તો અને ચાહનારાઓને પણ તેણે ગેબ થઇ જઈને, પ્રભુ વચ્ચે ધણા ધણા હેરાન ને હાડમાર કર્યા છે. અરે તારી “ કામન સેનસ ” નું બહુ થાય રે તાર ! તેં શું મોહકાન વાળી ! તેં નાહાસી જઈને શું ધાન કાઢાડ્યો !

તા. ૩ જુલાઈ ૧૮૯૫.

૧૧

## અમારા દેશી સરકારી ઓધેદારનો ભોમીયો.

જ્યારે આપણને હંચા ઓધા જેઈતા હોય ત્યારે દેશીઓની મદદ માટે ઓશીયાળા થઇ બેસવું, તેઓને તે માટે હોળીનાં નાળીયર બનાવવાં, અને તેઓ પાસ ગડબડ સડબડ કરાવીને તથા લખાણો અને ખાષાણો બુસરાવીને આપણું કામ કહાડી જવાને જરાક પણ તક ચુકવી નહીં.

આપણે પોતે દેશી લાભ અને દેશી હક માટે વહાણ કપાઈ જતા હોય એવું ટાળ તે વેળા આપણે દેખાડવું ; કાળી અને ગોરી ચામડી વચ્ચે તફાવત રાખવાનાં સરકારનાં કામ સામે આપણો પવીત્ર ધીકાર અને પાકીજગી ભરેલો ગુસો ખાલી કરી નાખવો, અને જે દેશીઓ આપણને ઓધે ચહાવી આપવાના કામમાં મદદગાર થતા હોય તેઓને બરડા સારી રીતે પસવારવા અને તેઓના ગાળપર મીઠી ચુમીઓ લેવાને કદી પણ પાછળ રેહેવું નહીં.

એવી ધાંધલ ધરપથ અને ગડબડ સડબડથી સરકારી બરા સાહાબો ગભરાવા માંડે અને આપણી તરફ નવાલો ફેંકવાને જેવા ચીનહો દેખાડે, કે આપણે આપણો સધળો રંગ અને ઢંગ ફેરવીજ નાખવો.

ગડબડ સડબડની હીલચાલોમાંથી આપણે સદ્ધાર્થી ખસી જવું, દેશના અને દેશી પ્રજાના લાભ તેજ આપણા પોતાના લાભ છે એમ ગણવાનું સમવડે 'લુહી જવું, અને નવાલો લઇને શ્રુપચુપ તે ઉપર મોઢું' મટમટાવવા માડવું.

સરકારી કુત્રા તરીકે ગણાવામાં આપણે માન અને મોઢાઈ સમજવી અને તેવી રીતે આપણને જ્યારે બોલાવવામાં અને ઝોળખવામાં આવે ત્યારે તેમાં અપમાન મુદ્દલજ સમજવું નહીં.

નવાલો મોઢાંમાં ગરપ થયો કે તરતજ આપણા સ્વતંત્રપણાને વેચી કાઢાડવું, તાબેદારીમાં આપણે વેચાઇ જવું, અને જે દેશી પ્રજાના દાદરથી આપણે ઉંચે ચઢડ્યા હોઈએ તેજ દાદરને ઉંચે મથાળે પોંહાંચ્યા પછી કકડાવીને લાત મારી ફેંકી દેવો.

તે પછી દેશ કોણ અને દેશી કોણ ? દેશી પ્રજાના હક શાના ને તેના લાભ શાના ? બાબ તો બધા આપણા ને નામદાર સરકારના અમલદાર વરગનાજ. એટલી વાત હંમેશાં ધ્યાનમાં રાખવી.

દેશીઓના લાભની દરેક હીલચાલમાંથી તે પછી આપણે દુરજ રહેવું. કાઈ જો તેમાં શામેલગીરી માગે તો સાફ ધસીને ના પાડવી, અને તેમ કરતાં કોઇવાર શરમ છંડાય નહીં તો કહેવું કે, બા અમે શું કર્યે ! અમે તો સરકારી નોકર પડ્યા એટલે અમારાથી કંઈ તેમાં ભાગ લેવાય ?

પણ જો ખાનપાન અને માનના કામો કરવાનાં હોય, કાઈ અકારા સાહેબોને આવલાં આપવાનાં હોય, દેશીઓને તેમાં ગાળ દેવાની હોય, તો બારે ઉલટ અને હરખ સાથ તેમાં ભાગ લેવાને ચુકવું નહીં.

તા. ૩ ૭ ફેબ્રુઆરી ૧૮૯૫



# GUJARATI.

(ANGLO-VERNACULAR.)

૧

## ગુજરાતી.



આ પુતળો ભો રે પુતળો !  
વાહ વાહ રે પુતળો !  
આ સસતો શોભઈતો પુતળો !  
આ સાકરીઆ પુતળો !  
આ માખણીઆ પુતળો !  
આ સાત સાબુએ ધોએભો પુતળો !  
વાહ વાહ રે પુતળો !  
આ પુતળો ભો રે પુતળો !

આ વાડીઆ શાજળ હીરાનો ધડેભો પુતળો !  
આ હારીસ સાહેબનો સુંદર પુતળો !  
ઝંઝઝતી નગરી, રાગ રંગીલા રાજ,  
હાથે પેહરી ચુડી, જપે જુડી માળા.  
ધન દોલતની નગરી, ઢંગ વગરના રાજ,  
નહીં ખખર રાજ સ્થિતિ નહીં પીછાણે પ્રજ.  
બળબુદ્ધિની નગરી, માન અકરામના રાજ,  
મિત્રો આપે સાલ પાધડી, કાઢે એના ચાલા.  
ઝંઝઝતી નગરી, રમતા કૂદતા રાજ,  
રૂપીએ શેર ખરશી, દોઢીએ શેર ખાવળા.

તા. ૩ જી ફેબ્રુઆરી સને ૧૮૯૫.

---

સમાપ્ત.

---

ઈંગ્લેન્ડ સાહેબ લોકના બાહારથી હસ્તાં મોહાંના અને મધુર વચની તથા પ્રસન્ન વદની “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ” નો કેટલો ભરસો ! બળવાના વખતમાં ચંદાલ નાના સાહેબે ઈંગ્લેન્ડની નીચમાં નીચ કતલ ચલાવી હતી, પણ તે “ રેસીડેન્ટ ” અને બહા સાહેબો પ્રત્યે હંમેસના હસ્તાં મોહાંને હતા. જે “ મેમ્બરો ” ને નાચપારડીઓ આપતો હતો તેણેજ તે ગુલામી નિર્દોષ ખાતુઓને બકરાંની પેઠે રેંહસાવી મારવાની દગલખાજ કીધી હતી.

પણ શું એમજ ઠરવું, સાહેબો, કે જેઓ લાર્ડ હારિસના “ દોસ્તો વખાણુનારાઓ ” નહી હોય તેઓએ તે નામદારને માન આપવાને આ સભામાં જવું નહી ? શું જેઓ સભામાં હાજર થાય તેઓ “ દોસ્તો ” પણ જોઈએ અને “ વખાણુનારા ” પણ જોઈએ ? શું તેઓ બેહુ હોવા જોઈએ ? શું એક જણ “ દોસ્ત ” હોય પણ કેટલીક બાબતમાં “ વખાણુનારા ” નહી હોય તેણે સભામાં નહી જવું ? હું પોતે પણ લાર્ડ હારિસને “ દોસ્ત ” છું. તે નામદારની હિમત અને દિલસોજી અને ખુલ્લું બડબડ બોલવું હું પસંદ કરું છું, તોપણ ઘણીખરી બાબતોમાં પ્રજાની માગણીઓ વિરૂધ્ધ તે નામદારની લાગણી હું પસંદ કરતો નથી. ત્યારે મારે શું કરવું ? હું તે નામદારના “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ” ના વર્ગમાં આવ્યો કે નહી ? કેાંઈ મેહરબાની કરીને બોલાસો કર્યો, સાહેબો ? પણ અહીં મારે કેહવું જોઈએ કે હું કાંઈ ખામખા સભામાં જવાની દરકાર કરતો નથી. કાંકે હું કાંઈ માનચાનનો લુખ્યો નથી, મારે કાંઈ સેરીક કે જડજ કે કાઉન્સીલનો મેમ્બર થવું નથી. મને કાંઈ સી. એસ. આર્થ. યા સી. આર્થ. ઇ. યા સરનાઇટ થવાનો અભખરો નથી. મારી બૈરીને કાંઈ “ લેડી ” ના વર્ગમાં બિરાજમાન થવાનો ચરટો નથી. ત્યારે હું “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ” ના વર્ગમાં ગણાઉં કે નહી ? અને તેઓની સભામાં હું જઈ શકું કે નહી ? હું ધારું છું કે નહી જાઉં તો સારું નહી તો કે ગવરનર સાહેબ તથા કમીશનર સાહેબનાં પુછાંમાં મારું નામ લેખાશે તે મને કેમ પાળવશે.

આહા ! એવા સાકરિયા જીભના “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ” વિષે લાર્ડ હારિસ પોતે શું ધારતા હશે ! પોતે એક પદ્મવી, એક આંધ્રી,

એક ખેતાળ કે માનચાનનો ટુકડો નાખેલો એવા ચાપલુશીખોરાઓ તે નામદારને “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ” ના એક બનાવડી નામના બાહના તળે બંધે હાથે ખુણા ખટોળાંની સભામાં કેવા પગે લાગવા પડે છે તે જોઈને તેઓ વિષે લાડ હારિસ પોતાના બિલોર જેવાં ચોખાં દિલમાં શું સમજતા હશે ? ખોદાતાળાએ માણસોનાં દિલ કાચના કાં નહીં બનાવ્યાં હશે ? લાડ હારિસ તો ઘણાજ ભોલા અને ખુદલાં દિલના સાહેબ છે. માટે તે નામદારનું દિલ જો બિલોરનું બનેલું હોત તો તેમાં જે કાંઈ હોય તે છુપાત નહીં અને પોતાના નવાજેલા આ હજુરિયા બંદાઓ વિષેનો તે નામદારનો ખરાં અંતઃકરણનો તિરસ્કાર તેનાં દિલના બિલોરમાંથી હું આપાદ દેખી શકત.

લાડ હારિસની મોટી ખુબી હું એ જોઈ છું કે તે નામદાર કોઈને દુશમન કરવાને ડરતા નથી. નામાંકિત શેરીડન પોતાના “ નિદાખાના ” માં કહી ગયો છે કે “ યુરં બોલનારા દુશમનોની વચે વસતું એ હિમતનું કામ છે અને જે પોતાના દુશમન કરવાને ડરે તે હીચકારો છે. ” વળી એજ કવિ નાટકયુરનું કહેલું છે કે “ સારા માણસની સારા માણસો વખાણુ કરે છે, પણ નહારા માણસો સારા માણસને પસંદ કરતા નથી. તે છતાં નહારાઓ જેને પસંદ કરે તે ચોડો ઘણાખી નહારાઓને નમ્યો એમ સમજવું. ” લાડ હારિસ તેવો માણસ નથી. પોતાને માટે યુરં બોલાવાની તેણે બીહીક રાખી નથી. તે નામદારને દુશમનોનો ડર નથી, પણ દુશમનોનો ખરાં ડર તો તેના “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ” જ દેખાડી ગિડ્યા છે.

તા. ૨૦ મી જાન્યુઆરી ૧૮૯૫.

### ૩

લાડ હારિસના “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ” (તે નામદારનો ધાણુ વાળનારાઓ)ને તેમની સભાની “ ફતેહ ” ને માટે શાખાશી આપીશું. તે બિચારાઓએ બીહતાં બીહતાં સભા બોલાવી—ખામખા શેહરીઓની જાહેર સભા ભરી નહીં—“ દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓનીજ ” આ સભા છે એમ તેઓએ જાણી પેકારે મરાવવાને કાંઈ બાકી રાખ્યું નહીં. પણ અતે ‘તેઓની સભાને જે ફતેહ મળી છે—એટલે કે જે ફતેહની તેઓ પોતાને

મોહડે બડાધ મારી ઉઠ્યા છે—તે પછી હવે તેઓ પોતાની ભુલ ઊંપર બળાપો કરે છે કે આપણે સૂઘળાં ઢોકોની જાહેર સભાજ કાં નહીં બોલાવી ? તેઓ અને તેમના દોલકી વગાડું ઇંગ્રેજ પત્રો સભાને જબજબ વખાણે છે. “ મોટી ” તથા “ વગવાળી ” કેહવાનું અને તેને જેમ અને તેમ મોટું રૂપ આપવાનું ડોળ ધાળે છે, જેઓ સભામાં હાજર હતા તેઓમાંના એકેએક ખુસામતિયાઓનું નામ છાપી ખતાવે છે, ત્યારે આપણે પુછીશું કે સભામાં કોણ કોણ હાજર નહીં હતા તેનો કાંઈ વીચાર કીધો ? જેઓ હાજર હતા, તેની સાથે જેઓ ગેરહાજર હતા તેમનાં પણ નામ કાં નહીં છાપી ખતાવતા કે હમેશાં સભાઓમાં બિરાજનારા આગેવાન અને આખરદાર કેટલા ગૃહસ્થોએ હાજર થવાનું દરસ્ત વીચાર્યું નહીં તે પણ માલમ પડત ?

પણ તેઓ સભામાં આવ્યા નહીં કાંકે તેઓને બોલાવ્યાજ નહીં હતા. તેઓ આવ્યા નહીં કાંકે આ કાંઈ જાહેર સભા ભરીજ નહીં હતી. ત્યારે તો બેહેતર કે પેહલેથી જાહેર સભાજ ભરી હોત. બેહેતર કે સર્વ ઢોકોને સભામાં બોલાવ્યાજ હોત. “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ” બિચારાઓ સભામાં કાંઈ તુફાન થવા વિષે ખીહતા હતા, રખે કોઈ સામેવાળો સભાનું ગગન ગળવે તેથી તેઓ ખીહતા હતા. પણ સભામાં કોઈ સામે તો થયા નહીં, કોઇએ તુશન તો કીધું નહીં, ત્યારે સભાના દરવાજા સર્વને માટે ખુલા મુકવાજ શું બેહેતર ન થાત ? એક દાહડે એક દોહડ-ચતુર ડાહયો બોલ્યો કે મેં ગએ સાલ મારી મીલકતનો વીમો નકામે ઉતરાવ્યો, કાંકે આગ તે કાંઈ લાગી નહીં અને વીમો ઉતરાવવાના પૈસા તો રદ ગયા ! એવીજ અકલ આ “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ” ની જાણુવી કે જેઓ પોતાના ડાલપાંખરાંઓ, પોતાના દીકરાઓ, અને દોતરાઓ, જમાઈઓ અને પુછડાંઓની સભા ભરીને હવે પસ્તાય છે કે એવી એક ખુણે ખટોળેની સભા ભરીને નાહકમાં નામ બદનામ કીધું અને જે ચીજથી ખીહતા હતા તેમાંનું તો કશું થયુંજ નહીં, તે એટલે સુધી કે વિરૂધ સભા ભરાવાનો ભય હતો તે પણ પાર પડ્યો નહીં.

વળી કેટલાક શોભા અને મોભાવાળા ગૃહસ્થો ગેરહાજર એમ રહ્યા હશે કે તેઓ ફક્ત “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ” ના વર્ગમાંજ નહીં હશે અથવા એ વર્ગમાં પોતાને પુછડાં ગણાવા તેઓએ ચાહ્યુંજ નહીં હશે.

“દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” એ શબ્દજ તેમને અળખામણો હશે કાંકે એ તો ગવરમેંટ હાઉસના હાથઓળુ ઓશીયાળા હન્ડુરિયાઓ અથવા આભારી આધાર પામેલાઓજ પોતાને કહી શકે. એવા હાથજેડું પુછડાંના વર્ગમાં કોણ સ્વતંત્ર માણુસ પોતાને ગણાવા ચાહશે વાઈ? એની કાલી વડાઈ તો કાળાભુળા ચાપલુસીખોર ખુશામતિયાઓજ પોતાનાં બહુબોલા મોટે મોહડે લઈ શકે. તેઓએ આ સભા “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ”ની હદમાં રાખીને પોતાની હદ બાહારના સઘળા સ્વતંત્ર સાહેબોને સભાની સંક્રમાંથી ગોચા દુર રાખ્યા, જેથી તેઓની ગેરહાજરીની અને નામદાર લાર્ડ હારિસની યાદગારીને ગેરધનસાઈ કરવાની બદનામી તેઓનેજ માથે આવી પડી

વાઈ “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” થી શું વકી રખાય? વખાણુનાં બાંકાં ઉપર બાંકાંજ તો ! બીજું શું? અને આ “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” પોતાની એ ફરજ તો અછી રીતે અદા કરી ઉઠ્યા છે. વખાણુ કરવાં એ કેવું સેહેલ કામ, કેવું મનપસંદ ને મીઠું કામ. એ ફરજ બજવવા કોણને નહીં ભાવે? કાંઈ ઠપકો આપવો હોય, કાંઈ શીખામણુ દેવી હોય તો તેના કડવાં વેણુ કેહવાં ભારી પડે, પણ જ્યાં સઘળું સાઈ સાઈજ ને મીઠું મીઠુંજ પિરસવાનું તે કામ બજવવાને કોણુ બાહાર નહીં પડે? અને અવશ્ય “દોસ્તો તથા વખાણુનારાઓ” તો કદીજ તેવાં બાંકાં ડુંકવાથી પાછળ નહીં હઠે.

કેહરે મોહડાં શું ભાવે છે? આ “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ” શું શું બોલ્યા છે તે જરા જુવો તો સહી. કેટલાકો નામદાર ગવરનર સાહેબની પરોણાગત બોગવી આવ્યા છે, આઘસકીમ અને ચંપીનનો મારો ચલાવી આવ્યા છે તેવા રક્ષાખીમેજર “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓએ” તે નામદારની ચંપીન પારટીઓની સ્તુતી ગાઈ છે. કોઈને ગવરનર સાહેબે પદવીઓ બક્ષી તે બક્ષેશનો બક્ષીદા બંદાઓ ઉપકારના ઉભરાથી વાળી આવ્યા છે. કોઈને ખેતાઓ બક્ષ્યા તેનાં પણ એ નામદાર બંદે નવાજના નવાબોલા બંદાઓ તરફથી બાંકાં ડુંકાયાં છે. પણ એ તો તે પ્રત્યેક આસામીની ખાનગી સેવા થઈ. તેમાં પ્રજાની જાહેર સેવા શી થઈ કે જેથી તેઓ પ્રજાનું નામ વચ્ચે લાવ્યા છે? પણ હું ભુલ્યો ! આ કાંઈ પ્રજાની કોઈ જાહેર સભા નહીં હતી ! એ તો “દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓની” જ સભા હતી અને એ તો તેઓ પોતાનીજ “તા તા તાબડી—ધીની રાંધી રાબડી” ના રાગ ગાઈ ઉઠ્યા છે.

કોઇ બોલ્યા કે સરકારી મેહલમાં “ પાછળે દરવાજેથી ” ધુસવાતું જે આગળા ગવરનરોના વખતમાં બનતું હતું તે સઘળું “ પેટિકોટ ઇન-ફ્લુઅન્સ ” નામદાર લાઈ હારિસના અમલમાં બંધ પડ્યું. આમ બોલનારાઓ તે “ આગળા ગવરનરો ” ના વખતમાં ક્યાં હતા ? શું પાછળા દરવાજેથી ધુસવાતું તેઓ તે વખતે જાણતા નહીં હતા ? અથવા શું તેઓને તે “ પેટિકોટ ઇન-ફ્લુઅન્સ ” નો અનુભવ નહીં હતો ? અને તોપણ આમ બોલનારાઓ તે આગળા ગવરનરોના પણ દોલકી વગાડુ “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણનારાઓ ” હતા ! એ તો એવાજ હોય તો. તે વખતે તે પેટિકોટોની કેવી તારીફ પર તારીફ હતી.

પણ આ સઘળી “ તા તા તાખડી ને ધીની રાંધી રાખડી ” ના રાગડાઓ વચ્ચે નામદાર લાઈ હારિસની એક ખરેખરી ખુબી અને સ્વતંત્ર સ્તુતિ ગવાઈ હતી. તે રાગડો કાહાડનાર મીં હોરમજીજી દાદાભાઈ પ્લીડર હતા, કે જેવણને એક જડજ દાખલ લાઈ હારિસથી સેવટનો ઇનસાફ મંજૂર છે અને તેથી તેવણનાં હૈડાંને ઘણી તાહાડક વળી છે. તેવણના કેહવા મુજબ લાઈ હારિસના અમલમાં નીચલા વર્ગના લોકોને આખો ટોળોજ ફજયત થઈને ઝંધો વળ્યો છે. *The whole swarm of sycophante parasites, tale—bearers, self-aggrandisers all creatures born of corruption and feeding on corruption*—એટલે કે “ ખુસામતિયાઓ, આપમતલબિયા કાનભરો, કથા કરો, નજવા કીડા જેવાઓ, રસ્તવખોરા લાંચિયાઓતું આખું યુથતું યુથ ” જે આગળા ગવરનરોના અમલ વેળા સરકારી મેહલમાં બનતું હતું તેઓ સઘળાઓને લાઈ હારિસના અમલમાં પગજ ગયો છે એમ મીં હોરમજીજી કેહ છે. અમને લાગે છે કે એ ખરી વાત છે. પણ ત્યારે સભામાં બિરાજેલા “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણનારાઓ ” ની આ ટીપ ગોપર નજર કરો. જે એકલપેટા આપલુસીખોરાઓને મીં હોરમજીજી એટલાખંધા ધિક્કારે છે તેઓજ શું તે આગળા અમલમાં ગવરમેંટ હાઉસમાં ધુસનારાઓ નહીં હતા ? અને તેઓજ શું આ વખતે ગવરનર સાહેબને રાજી રાખનાર દોલકી વગાડવા તથા ભેંપુરા ભુંકવાને નીકળ્યા નથી ? નામદાર લાઈ હારિસે એ વર્ગના એકલપેટાઓને ગવરમેંટ હાઉસમાંથી હાંકી કાહાડ્યા એ ખરું છે. પણ મને લાગે છે કે તે નામદાર હવે પોતાના અમલની આખરીએ છેક છેલ્લે જતી વખતે તેજ વર્ગનાં ખુસામતનાં



ખોરિયાંઓને પાછા નમે છે કે જ્યારે એ નામદાર પ્રજના એવા હાથઓળુ ઓશીયાળાઓ તરફનું માન કબુલ રાખીને જાય છે. આ “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ” કેવા માણસો છે તે લાડ હારિસ સાર્સપેઠે સમજતા હોવા જોઈયે. તેઓને મીં હોરમજી દાદાભાઈએ બરાબર આપાદ લાગુ પડતી સર્ટીફિકેટ આપી છે, અને તોપણ તેઓનાંજ આહારથી હસ્તાં મોહાંની ખુસામત જો તે નામદાર માન્ય કરીને સિધારે તો મીં હોરમજીએ તે નામદારની સ્તુતિનાં ગાયલાં ગીતો શું ખોટાં પડતાં નથી ?

વળી આપણા આ હિમતવાન હાકમનાં વખાણુનાર મીં હોરમજીનાં આ વચનો જોલેજોલ ખરેખરાં છે, કે લાડ હારિસ કાંઈ માન યા વખાણુના લુખ્યા નથી. તે નામદારે લોકોનો ખ્યારો થવાની દરકારજ કાઢી નથી. જેમ તે નામદારે ખટપટને ધિક્કારી છે તેમ લોકોને રાજી રાખવાનું પણ તે નામદારે ધિક્કાર્યું છે અને એટલા માટેજ તે નામદાર આજે લોકપ્રિયને બદલે લોકોમાં અપ્રિય થયા છે અને અપ્રિય થવા માટે તે નામદાર ખુશી છે. મીં હોરમજીનું કહેલું એ સઘળું ખરું છે. પણ શું એ ખરી વાતમાં કાંઈ ખુખી છે ? એક જણુ સર્વમાં અપ્રિય અજખામણો થવાની દરકાર નહી કરે, અને પ્રજના અભાવ અથવા અરૂચીમાં ખુશી યાય, તે શું કાંઈ ખુખીની વાત છે ? શું મીં હોરમજી પોતે પ્રજાપ્રિય નથી ? શું તેવણુ લોકોમાં અણુગમતા થવાનું પસંદ કરશે ? એ હિમતનું કામ છે ખરું, પણ માણસજાતની ખાસિયત જોતાં એ ખરું નથી. સદા સાચું બોલનાર લોકમતની દરકાર કરતો નથી, માટે જેણે લોકપ્રિયતા ખોહી હોય તે ઘણીવાર સાચો માણસ હોય છે ખરો; લાડ હારિસમાં આપણને તેવો એક હાકમ મળ્યો છે. તે નામદારે લોકો ખુશી થશે કે નાખુશી તે વિષે જાણુકે કશી પરવાજ રાખી નહી હોય એવાં તે નામદારનાં કેટલાંક કામો આપણે દીઠાં છે. પણ એવી જાતની પ્રજાને અપ્રિય હાકમી કદી ખુશી થવાજોગ એક ખુખીમાં તો કવચીતજ ગણાશે.

જોકે સભામાં કાંઈ તુફાન કે ગડબડ તો નહી થઈ તોપણ આ “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણુનારાઓ ” પોત પોતામાં એકમત અને ઘણા ખુશી તો નહીજ હતા. મીં હોરમજી દાદાભાઈનું બાપણુ લંબાણુ થઈ જવાથી સભાએ સાંભળવાને નાખુશી બતલાવી અને તેવણુને “ ખેસી જવો ! ” “ ખેસી જવો ! ” એવા પોકારોથી બોલતા અટકાવવા માગ્યા. એક “ દોસ્ત

અને વખાણનાર” ડાક્ટર કાવસજી હોરમજીએ નામદાર ગવરનર સાથના પોતાના “ જાતી વેહવાર ” ઉપરથી લાઈ હારિસને પોતાનું આવળું પસંદ નથી એમ સભાને ખબર આપવા માગી. પણ ખીજા “ દોસ્ત અને વખાણનાર ” મી० આકવરે ઉઠીને આ વાત કરતાં ડાક્ટર કાવસજીને અટકાવવા માગ્યા. કાંકે મી० આકવરે ખરું કહ્યું તેમ આ “ દોસ્ત અને વખાણનારાઓ ” એ કાંઈ ગવરનર સાહેબની યાદગારી માટે આવળું મુકરર કરાવ્યું નહી હતું, પણ તે યાદગારી કેવા આકારમાં જળવવી, તે કરાવવાનું હજી તો એક કમીટીને સોંપ્યું છે. આ “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણનારાઓ ” ના બોલવાનો તે કાંઈ ઢંગ ધડો છે વાર ?

એકજ “ દોસ્ત અને વખાણનાર ” વખાણનાં બાંકાંઓ પુકવાને બદલે કાંઈક ટિકા કરવા જેવું ડોલ દેખાડ્યું હતું. તે ટિકા તેણે લાઈ હારિસના ટિકાકારો ઉપરજ ચલાવી હતી. એ “ દોસ્ત અને વખાણનાર ” કોઈ એક દત્તાત્રિયા દાજી અધિકારી નામનો “ રાવબાહદુર ” છે કે જેને નામદાર લાઈ હારિસેજ એ ખેતાખ બહેલો લાગે છે. તેણે કહ્યું કે લાઈ હારિસની કારકિર્દી ઉપર ટિકાકારો પ્રમાણિકપણે ટિકા ચલાવે તો તે ફાયદાભરેલું છે, પણ જ્યારે તેઓ છળકપટથી દવેશભાવિક ટિકા કરેછે ત્યારે તે ટીકા બદ્ધ્યાનતી અને બેધમાનીભરેલી થઈ પડે છે એ વાત તદન ખરી છે. પણ તેમજ ખીજા હાથ ઉપર આ “ દોસ્ત અને વખાણનાર ” તુમડિયાબાવા દત્તાત્રિયને આપણુ પુછીશું કે જેમ વીરધ ટિકાને તેમજ તરફેણની ટિકાને પણ એજ સિધાંત લાગુ પડે છે કે નહી ? એક ટિકા જેમ વીરધ પક્ષની હોય તેમ તરફેણની પણ હોય છે. જેમ કોઈ વિરોધિ ટિકાકાર છળકપટથી ટિકા કરે તેમ કોઈ તરફેણનો ટિકાકાર આપમતલખથી પોતાનો પાડ વાંળવા અને મોટા સાહેબને મોહડાં ઉપર રાજી રાખવા સારું પોતાની તુમડીમાં તારીફના કાકડા ગળાડાવે તો તે પણ બદ્ધ્યાનતી અને બેધમાનીભરેલી ટિકા કેહવાય કે નહી ? દાલાં વખાણનાં બાંકાં પુકવાં એ કાનફટિયા સાધુબાવાઓનુંજ કામ હોય છે. કપટથી કરેલી વેરભાવિક ટિકા તો જેને કાંઈ ઓછું પડ્યું તેવા નાસિપાસ થયલાઓનાં બળતરાંના આપમતલખથી બખાળા માત્ર હોય. તેમજ વખાણનાં બાંકાં પુકનારાઓ પોતાને કાંઈ વધુ પડ્યું હોય, પોતાનું પેટ ભરાયું હોય અને તરિયાર તાહડું થયું હોય તેના ઉપકારમાં તેઓ જે કાંઈ બોલે તેમાં પણ તેમની આપમતલખ ઊંધાડી દેખાઈ આવે છે. તેઓ તો પોતાને મોહડેજ પોતાને “ દોસ્તો અને વખાણનારાઓ ” કેહે છે.

તા० ૩ જી ફેબ્રુઆરી સને ૧૮૯૫.

# HINDI PUNCH.

(ANGLO-VERNACULAR.)

૧

જોધયે છે—“કામન સેન્સ.”

મારા પયારા લારડ હેરીસ,

તરફી આપું છું તે માફ કરશો. પણ પ્રસંગ ધણો જરૂરનો છે અને તમારી મદદ વગર કામ થાય નહીં એમ છે, દખલના મરાઠામાંથી જેમ “કામન સેન્સ” (સાદી સમજ) જતી રહી છે, તેમ તમારા કેટલાક દોસ્તો અને ચાહનારાઓને “કામન સેન્સ” છોડી ગઈ છે અને તેમને તેણે દગો દીધો છે. તેથી તમે નામદારની યાદગારી જાળવવાનાં કામને નામે જે ગમે તે હંબગ તેઓથી થઈ જાય છે. તેના અટકાવ માટે તમે નામદારે પોતે તેઓને “કામન સેન્સ” નો એક મજબુત “ડોક” અત્યાર આગમજનો આપ્યો હશે, એમ હું ધારું છું; પણ જો તે નહીં આપ્યો હોય તો હવે આ વખત છે કે જ્યારે તેમને તેની ધણીજ જરૂર છે. મેહેરબાની કરીને તે આપી દેશો, કે જેથી તેમનાં ભેજાંમા “સાદી સમજ” (કામન સેન્સ) પાછી દાખલ થઈ જાય અને તેઓ પ્રજા સાથે ઘેલાં ચેડાં કાઢાડતાં અટકે અને એવા હંબગ અને ઢીંગ ઉભાં કરે નહીં ?

હીંદી પંચ આપ્રીસ, }  
ક્રીયર રોડ, મુંબઈ, }  
૧૧-૧૧-૮૪. }

હું છું, મારા પયારા લારડ હેરીસ,  
તમારો સદાનો સાચો મીત્ર,  
હીંદી પંચ. ]

૨

“ગવંડર શાએખનો પુતલો (!) કરો !”

નામદાર માહારાજ શ્રી પંચોખા,

હીંદી પંચ પ્રજાના માહારાજ જેમ.

સાહેબ-આપણા ગવરનર સાહેબ લાહોટ-સાહાબ હેરીસ આવતે વરસ અહીંથી ગાંસડા પોટલાં લઇને ધરેબારે જાય, તે આગમજ તેમની યાદ-

ગારીમાં એક મોટો જેવો પુતલો (!) ઉભો કરવાનો અમારો વીચાર છે, આટે તમે સાહેબ તેમાં ખોલે ખોલે રૂપયા ભરશો? જો તમે હા કહો તો અમે આ કામ માથે લઇ લઇએ અને ગવરનર સાહેબના વાહાલા થવા સાથે આખી એંગલો-ઇન્ડીયન પ્રજા પાસે અમારી પીઠ ઠોકાવશે. કંગાળ કાળા દેશીઓ તો અમેને તે માટે ઝુરાળું ગાળ દેશેજ અને અમારી આ ઊત્તમ યોજનાને ખાસડાંના હાર અને કોહેલાં ધડાં તથા છાણના મારથી વધાવશે, તે માટે અમેને શક નથી, પણ તમે નામદાર શ્રી માહારાજ પંચોળા જેવા પચાસ સો શ્રીમંતો, પુછડાઓ, લડીંગીયાંઓ અને એવા તેવાઓ હા પાડો તો એવા વધાવાની અને સરપાવની અહીં એક ચમટી ધુળ બરાબરથી અમે દરકાર કરીશું નહી, તે જાણો.

અમે છઈએ, સાહેબ, તમારા ઇન્

કાળુભાઇ સાબુગોરા,

નવરાજી નકામાજી,

ફાયર-વરક ફટ-ફટ.

મેશરસ કાળુભાઇ સાબુગોરા, નવરાજી નકામાજી અને

ફાયર-વરક ફટ-ફટ જોગ.

સાહેબો, તમે સાહેબોનો માયાળુ પત્ર પોંહેંચ્યો છે. હકીકત બધી જાણી. ગવરનર સાહેબનો પુતલો કરવાની તમારી ઊલટ અને કાળજી કરતાં તે માટેની તમારી હીમત વધારે વખાણને પાત્ર છે. તેને હીમત કેહેવી કે સોખાઇ અને એઅદમી કેહેવી, તે માટે કેટલાક તમારા હેતના કટકાઓને વીચાર પડી જશે; પણ તમે તેની ચમટી ધુળ બરાબરથી દરકાર કરવાને જ્યારે તઈયાર નથી, ત્યારે તે માટે નકામી માથાફાડ કરવાની શી જરૂર ?

મેહેરજાન સાહેબો, લાહાટ સાહાબનો પુતલો તમે ઊભો કરો તો બલે. તે માટે પદસા જોઇતા હોય તો તે આપનારાઓને ગુજરાત, કાઠ્યાવાડ અને દખણમાં ખુને ખાંચરેથી શોધી કાઢાડશો. પણ હીંદી પંચ પ્રજાના માહારાજ શ્રી પંચોળાની તરફથી તે માટે એક પુટી બદામની પણ આશા રાખશો ના. તેમની પંચ પ્રજા, જણાવવાને દલગીર છીએ કે, તે માટે એક પાઇના પણ ખરચની રજા આપતી નથી.

તમે સાહેબો એ પુતલો (!) કરવા માટેની યોજના રચવા આગમજ લાહાટ સાહાબ હેરીસનું મત તો લીધું હશે. પણ માહારાજ શ્રી પંચોળાને તે માટે કંઈ શક પડી મથે છે. તેઓ માને છે કે દક્ષીણ માહારાષ્ટ્રની અકલ (common sense) જતી રહેથી એકબીજા લાહાટ-સાહાબ ધારતા હોય, પણ તેમની પોતાની સાદી સમજ (common

sense) જતી રહેલી તેઓ પોતે કદી ધારેતા નહીજ હશે. માહારાજ શ્રી પંચોળાને વીશવાસ છે કે લાહટ-સાહુખ પોતાનો પુતલો ઉભો કરવાનાં કામને પોતેજ એક હંખ ધારે અને તેવું માન લેવાને પોતેજ ના પાડે, એટલી સાદી સમજ અને સાદી અકલ (common sense) તો તેમનામાં છેજ. અને તેટલા માટે તેમની “સાદી સમજ” ને (“કોમન સેન્સ”ને) એકવાર અપીલ કરી જોવાથી તેઓ તે ઘણી અછી રીતે દેખાડી દેશે, એવો તેમને ભરસો છે.

ક્રીયર રોડ કેસલ, } હું છું. સાહેબો, તમારો ઈતયાદી,  
હોદી પંચ પેલેસ, } રમુજ ઠોલીયા-રમતા પંચી, નામદાર માહારાજ શ્રી પંચોળાના ખાનગી સેક્રેટરી.  
તા. ૧૧-૧૧-૯૪ }

## ૩

## એક છુપાં સરકયુત્તરની નકલ.

નામદાર રાજ સાહેબ,

તમે નામદારને રોશન હશે કે આવતે વરસ આપણા મોટા મુરખી અને દોસ્ત લાહટ સાહેબ ધરેખારે સીધારે છે.

૨ તેઓ નામદાર આ કાળી લુમીના કાળા કીનારાને છેલો સેજદો કરી જાય તે આગમય તેમની તરફ પોતાના માનની જાંચામાં જાંચી (હીમાલય કરતાં પણ વધારે જાંચી) અને ખસં દીલતી લાગણી લાયકમા લાયક રીતે બતાવવાની ખાહેશ જુદી જુદી કોમો સામાનય રીતે ધરાવે છે. જુદી જુદી કોમોને સામગ્રી ભેગી કરીને તેમનાં મત તે વીષે લેવાની અમે કુચ દરકાર કરી નથી, કારણ અમારા મત મુજબ અમે જે જણાવયે છીએ તેજ ખરું છે. વળી જે મત લેવાં જઈએ અને કાંઈ બંગાણ પડી જાય તો ઓજળ.

૩ એ નામદાર માટે જે માન ધરાવવામાં છે તેની નીશાની તરીકે તેની યાદગારી હમેશ સુધી કાયમ રાખવા માટે એક મોટા પુતળો ઉભો કરવાની સુચના કરવામાં આવે છે. કોણ તરફથી અને ક્યાંથી તે કરવામાં આવે છે તે તો અલ્લા જાણે, પણ અમારા એકલાં ભેજાંમાંની તે ઉત્પત્તી છે એમ તો તમોએ મુદલજ સમજવું નહી.

૪ એ હીલચાલમાં આગેવાન ભાગ લેવા અને ઉધરાણાની ટીપમાં એણે ખોલે રૂપયા ભરી આપવાને તમે એક પગે ખડા છેઓ કે નહીં ? અમે તો ધારયે છીએ કે તમે અત્યાર આગમજના એવી તર્કચારીમાંજ હશે.

૫ જો તમે નામદાર “હા” ભણુશો—અને “ના” ની તો અમે વ-કી રાખીજ નથી—તો એક જાહેર સભા ખોલાવી તેમાં જાહેર લોકો ત-રીકે અમે અને અમારા જેવા ખીજાઓ હાજર થઈશું, અને ત્યાં તમારા નામની ખોલખાલા પોકરાવીશું તે જાણીએ.

અમે છઈયે, તમારા  
ધત્યાદી ધત્યાદી.

તા. ૨ જી ડીસેમ્બર ૧૮૯૪.

૪

વાંચો ! વાંચો !! વાંચો !!!

આ ખાસ જાહેર ખખર જરૂર વાંચજો.

થંડીની મોસમ માટે ખાસ વરદીથી બનાવેલો  
નવીજ જાતનો ઊંચો ૧૨માસુ પાક નામે

પુતળા-ફંડ-હંબગ-પાક.

મેસરસ પેનડયુલમ એન્ડ કંપનીમાંથી મંગાવી લેજો.

આ પાકના થોડાક જાણીતા ફાયદા તો વાંચી જુવો :—

આ પાકથી લેંજને ભમરી થઈ આવે છે.

તે ખાધાથી છાતીપર ખટાસ અને કલેજાંપર ભાર દેખાય છે.

તે ખાનારાઓનાં દીલમાં લોહી માસનો વધારો થવાને બદલે તે સુકાઈ જવાની વધારે વધી રહે છે.

તેથી દીલમાં ઉકળાટ થઈ આવે છે, અને આંતરડાં વળ ખાઈ જાય છે.

તા. ૯ મી ડીસેમ્બર ૧૮૯૪.

## “ક્રામન સેન્સ”થી ભરપુર થોડાક સાદા સવાલો.

નામદાર ગવર્નર લારડ હેરીસનો પુતળો જીભો કરવાના ફૂંડમાં જે સાહેબો જોભે જોભે પછસા ભરી આપવાની છછા ધરાવતા હોય તેઓએ તે ભરતી વેળા નીચલા સવાલો ઉપર વીચાર કરવાની યાદ રાખવી :—

આપણે “ક્રામન સેન્સ” (સાદી સમજ) ધરાવયે છીયે ?

જેઓએ આ ફૂંડ ઉજી કીધું છે તેઓમાં “ક્રામન સેન્સ” (સાદી સમજ) છે ?

લારડ હેરીસ પોતે “ક્રામન સેન્સ”થી વીચાર કરે તો આ પુત-  
લાનું માન કયુલ રાખશે ?

પ્રજા આપણી “સેન્સ” (સમજ)ને હસશે તો નહીં ?

લોકો આપણને “ક્રામન સેન્સ” વગરના ધારશે તો નહીં ?

“ક્રામન સેન્સ”થી વીચાર કરયે તો પુતળાનું માન કેવા હાકમને ઘટે ?

આપણે પોતે હંબગ થતા તો નહીં હોઈયે ?

લારડ હેરીસ પોતે આ કામને હંબગ ગણતા નહીં હશે ?

સમજીઓ, શીખેલાઓ, અને પ્રજા વચે આપણો ફુરીયો તો નહીં થઈ જાય ?

આપણે મનમાં માનયે છીયે એક અને કરીયે છીયે બીજું, એવું બધાઓ સમજી તો નહીં જાય ?

આપણે જાહેર હીમતના કરતાં જાહેર હીચકારાપણું વધારે ધરાવયે છીયે એવો અરથ તો કોઈ કરવા નહીં નીકળે ?

ચઈસાના પછસા કાઢાડી આપીને વળી ખેવકુક અને ગધેડામાં તો નહીં ખપયે ?

તા. ૫ મી ડીસેમ્બર ૧૮૯૪.

## લાહાટ સાહાબના દોસ્તોને આવતી કાલનું ખાસ ધજન.

લાહાટ સાહાબ હેરીસના દોસ્તો, ચાહનારાઓ, વખાણનારાઓ, ખેર-ખાહો, લટીંગીયાઓ, પુછડાંઓ, ઇત્યાદી ઇત્યાદી, વગેરે વગેરે, સરવે સાહેબોને આવતી કાલનું ખાસ મોડું ધજન છે.

એ સરવે સાહેબોને જણાવવામાં આવે છે કે, આવતી કાલે પાંચ વાગતાનો ટકોરો થતાંજ ટકોરો ચહડાવયાવીના ખાન બહાદુર મંચેરજી કાવસજી મરજખાન સાહુઆઆખની “ ગુલેસ્તાન ” ખાગમાં મેહેરખાનીની રાહે તસદી લેવી.

તેઓએ તે વેલા પોતાની સાથે માખણની કુપ, મસકાનાં પીપ, ધીની ડબરી, મધનાં માટલાં, શાકરના કોહલા અને શીરાના ખાટલા લેતા આવવાને ચુકવું નહી.

સાથે સાથે તેઓએ નોટનાં બંડલ અને નગદ રૂપયાના કોહલા પોતાનાં ગજવામાં અને બગલમાં મારતા આવવું, અને લાહાટ સાહેબના માનમાં ખાનપાનનો મેળાવડો કરવા માટેનાં ફંડમાં તેઓએ એક આંકડો ને ત્રણ મીંડાં ઉપર ચહડાવવાના નેક ધરાદા અને ભલા ઠરાવ સાથે પધારવુંજ.

આ મેળાવડાની મેનીજ કરનારા અહસ્થોને તેમનાં નેક કામમાં અને સસતી કીરતી અને મોંઘાં માન ખાટવાનાં ભલી ભલાધના કાર્યમાં પોતાની ભલી મદદ અને ટેકો આપવા તથા પોતાની સેવાઓ તેમની જનાબમાં રજુ કરવાને જે અહસ્થો ખાહેશમંદ હોય, તેઓને જણાવવામાં આવે છે કે, મેહેરખાનીની રાહે તેઓએ ફરબે બકરાંઓપર વેતરા મુકવા માટે પોતાની સાથે ધારદાર છરીઓ અને કાતરો લેતા આવવું.

જે સાહેબોને આ કામ સામે સુગ હોય, જેઓનાં નાકનાં નસકોરાં એ કામની વાત જાણતાંજ ચહડી ગયાં હોય, તેઓએ મેહેરખાની કરીને આ ધજનને માન આપવાની તસદી લેવી નહીજ.

જે સાહેબોને આ સસતાં માન અને સોંધી કીરતી ખાટવાના કામના આગેવાન સાહેબોએ ભાવ પુછ્યો નહી હોય, તેઓ તેમનાં પોતાની પ્રામિ-



લગીરી આપવા અને પોતાનાં નામોને ઠાંઠ કરાવવા માગતા હોય, જેઓના મનથી જગની બત્રીસીએ ચહડયા તો શું અને નહી ચહડયા તો શું, એ સંઘર્ષ સરખું હોય. તેઓએ મેહેરબાની કરીને ખાનબહાદુર મરજખાન સાહાબના ગુલેસ્તાન બાગમાં આવતી કાલે બેલાસક વગર ઈજને પણ પધારવું. તેમને ધકા મારીને બાહર કાઢાડવામાં આવશે નહી, પણ સામા પગે પડીને અને નમી નમીને સલામ કરીને ખુરસીઓ આપવામાં આવશે.

અંગ્રેજ પત્રોના રીપોર્ટર સાહેબોને ખાસ ઈજન છે કે, મેહેરબાની કરીને સમાનો રસરસતો અને ધીનો ગગરતો હેવાલ લેવા અને તેમાં સહરાધાત કરવા, બાંકાં ડુંકવા, અને જે ગમે તે નાલમાં ફેંકવા માટે સવા પાંચ વાગતામાં પોતાની ખાસ જગાપર આવીને બેસવું. તેઓ સાહેબો માટે ખાસ બિચી ટેબલો અને તખત રોકી ખુરશીઓ અલાહે-દીજ તદ્યાર રાખવાને લુધી જવામાં આવશે નહી, તેની તેઓએ મેહેરબાનીની રાહે નોંધ લેવીજ.

તા૦ ૬ ઠી જાનેવારી સને ૧૮૯૫.

## ૭

લારડ હેરીસ માટે મી૦ પંચ તરફનું માનપત્ર.



મારા લારડ,

તમે નામદાર મુબઈને છેલી સલામ કરી જાઓ તે આગમજ તમોને એક માનપત્રથી નવાજવાને તમારા સદાના સાથી, રાહબર, દોસ્ત શીલસુદ્ધ મી૦ પંચે ધણો ધણો વીચાર કરી જોયો છે, તે જાણીજોજી.

તમારી કારકીરદીના પાંચ વરસની તવારીખનો પોથો તે માટે તેણે બઠલાવી જોયો છે, અને માનપત્રમાં ઘુસાડવા લાયકનાં અને તમોને માનપત્ર અને મધમાં લપેટી નાખવાને લાયકનાં કામોની ડબલ મોટો ચશમે પેહરીને તેણે તેમાં શોધાશોધ ચલાવી છે, તે જાણીજોજી.

તે શોધનું પરીણામ માઠાં બાયજે બહુ નાસીપાસી ઉપજવનાર આવ્યાથી અને માનપત્રમાં શોમે એવાં કોઇ કામો નહી જડયાથી, તમે

નામદારનાં ખુને ખાંચરે પડેલાં કોઈ રૂઠાં કુઠાં કામોપરજ શુકરાના કર-  
ખાની તેને ફરજ પડી છે. તેવાં કામને પણ માનપત્રને લાયકનાં ગણવાનું  
મોટું દીલ ચલાવીને તેણે બંધે મસાલનાં ઉજરડાં સાથે ખુણે ખુણે શોધ  
કીધી છે, અને જણાવવાને ઘણી મોટી ખુશાલી અને ઘણો ભારી સંતોષ  
પેદા થાય છે કે, તેમાં તેને સારે દરજ્જે ફતેહ મળી છે. તે ફતેહ માટે  
તે હજારો હજાર શુકરાના કરે છે, તે જાણીએ.

તમારું તેવું રૂઠું કુઠું કામ “તનની ફેળવણીને ઉતેજન અને મદદ”  
આપવાનાં નામથી ઓળખાય છે, અને પાંચ વરસની તમારી કારકીરદીને  
સરવેથી જાંચી કીરતીની ટોચપર પુગાડનારાં કામ તરીકે તેને ઠોકી  
મેસાડવામાં કસી ખરખાંચ કે લાજ શરમ સમજવાની જરૂર નથી  
તે જાણીએ.

તમારી કીરતીનાં તે એકલાં કામમાંથી ઘણાં ઘણાં વધન નડે એમ  
છે, અને તે મી. પંચ જાણે છે. પણ તેને અહીં યાદ કરવાની કાંઈ  
જરૂર છે? જ્યાં કંઈથી કરીને તમે નામદારને માનપાત્ર આપવાનો મોટાં  
દીલનો સવાલ છે, ત્યાં એવી બારીકીમાં ઉતરવાની કે તે બારીકીને જરાક  
પણ કોઠું આપવાની જરૂરજ શી છે?

મી. પંચને ખબર છે કે તમે નામદારના હેતના કટકાઓ, તનની  
ફેળવણીને તમેએ આપેલાં ઉતેજનની વાતને કકડા યુક્લા કરવા નીકળશેજ  
નીકળશે. તેઓ છાતી ઠોકીને પુછવાની સોખાધપર ઉતરશે કે, જે તમે  
સાહેબ તનની ફેળવણીના મદદગારજ છેઓ તો, અઠવાડયાંમાં બે દાહડા  
અરધો પોણો દજન પોણો રમનારા અંગ્રેજો, ક્રીકેટનાં આખાં મેદાનને  
ધાધ પડીને ક્રીકેટ ખેલનારા સેંકડો જુવાનોને હેરાનગતી આપે છે, તેનો  
તમે કાંઈથી ઉપાય કીધો છે? એલફ્રીનસ્ટન કાલેજ અને દખણ કાલેજના  
વીદ્યારથીઓમાં અંગબળની કસરતને વધારો કરવા માટે માંગવામાં આ  
વેલી મદદ તમે કદી આપી છે? અને કેહી સ્કુલોને રમતગમત માટે  
ખોલી જગાઓ તમે ભેટ આપીને નવાજી છે? અથવા તેમને અંગબળની  
કસરતો ખેલવામાં આગળના કરતાં વધુ મદદ કીધી છે? એવા એવા  
અગવડભર્યા સવાલ કરનારાઓ ગમે તેટલા નીકળે તેમની કસી દરકાર  
નહીજ કરવી, એવા રાખેલા નેક ડરાવને વળગીને ચાલવામાંજ મી. પંચ  
મક્કમપણું સમજે છે તે જાણીએ. અને તેટલા માટેજ આ માનપત્રમાં  
તેમને કોઠું નહી આપીને મી. પંચ આગળ ચાલે છે.

પણ આમળ ચાલતાં તમે નામદારને માખણ અને મધ પીરસવા માટે ખીજી લખવું, તે તેમને સુઝતું નથી. તેમની પેનને તમારાં કીરતીવંત કામોની ખીજ કસી ચાલ આવતી નથી અને તેથી તે અહીં અટકી પડી છે. આટલા માટે હાલ તુરત થોડી જગા કોરી રાખીનેજ તેમને આ માનપત્ર પુરું કરવું પડે છે. જો તમે નામદારનાં કાંઈ કીરતીવંત કામો હાથ લાગી જશે તો આ કોરી જગામાં તે લખી કઢાડવાની તસ્દી તેવણ ખુશી સાથ માથે ઉઠાવશે તે જાણજોજી:

તમે નામદારનાં કીરતીવંત કામોની નોંધ કરવા માટે રાખેલી કોરી જગા.

હું છું, મારા લારડ, તમારો ઈં

ફરી પાંચનો ખાનગી સેક્રેટરી.

જાણ, તા. ૧૩ મી જાન્યુઆરી ૧૯૬૫.

## મુંબઈમાં નવા કર.

“પુતળાં-ફંડ-ટેક્ષ” —લાહાટ સાહાય હેરીસે પાંચ વરસની કારકીરદીમાં જે મુવેલા વાધ મારી નાખ્યા છે તેની યાદગારીમાં તે નામદારનો એક પુતળો (!) ઉભો કરવા માટે આ કર ધરેધર નાખવામાં આવશે. તે વસુલ કરનારાં ખાતાંનું વડપણ ધણું કરીને ધાંચીના બેલોને નહીં પણ આપણા આંધરેબેલોને આપવામાં આવશે.

ખાનખાન ટેક્ષ —લાહાટ સાહાય હેરીસે તનની કેલવણીને ધણી ધણી મદદ કીધી છે, તે માટે આ અકારો કર સામાન્ય પ્રજા ઉપર નાખવામાં આવ્યો છે. તે ઊગરાવવાનું સસતી કીરતી અને સોંધાં માનનું કામ મેસરસ જમશેદજી એમ. ફરામજી પટેલ, ઇબરાહીમ રહીમતુલા એંડ કંપનીને હરતક કરવામાં આવ્યું છે, જે તેઓએ ખુશી સાથે ઉચકી લીધું છે. પણ પ્રજા તરફથી તો તરેહવાર પ્રકારની શાલપામરીની પેહેરામણી એ કરના આગેવાન સાહેબોને કરવામાં આવે છે હો. પણ મરને પ્રજા મમે તે બોલે અને બકે. અગ્રેજી છાપા અને અગ્રેજી દેવા છે ? તેઓ તો ખચીતજ તેમને તેમના કામમાં જશ અને ફતેહ ઈચ્છશે. એ ઈચ્છામાં અમારી તરફની એવી આશા ઉમેરીશું કે, તેમની આ માહબ્બરત સેવાનો બદલો તેમના નામ પછવાડે વળગાવવાનાં કાંઈ કાંઈ પુછડાંઓની નવાજેશ કરીને નામદાર સરકાર વાળી આપશે તો બહુ મેહેરબાનીજ થશે. તેથી ભવીષ્યમાં એવાં સસતાં માન અને સોંધી કીરતી ખાટવાનાં કામો કરનારાઓની રેલછેલ થઈ જશે અને જ્યારે જેઈએ ત્યારે તેમનો દુકાલ મુદ્દલજ દેખાશે નહીં.

ટાંગ-ધતુરા-ધુલ-ધમાસા-તમાસા ટેક્ષ-વીદાય ચતા ગવરનર સાહેબ ધણા ધણા પ્રજાખારા છે, તેવણુ ઉપર લોકો ધણાં ધણાં પીડા છે, અને તેવણુ સામે કોઈને કસો અણુમનો છેજ નહીં એવું દેખાડવા

ખાતર પ્રબળને નામે ઢાંઝ-ધતુરા અને હુલ્લ ધમાસાના તમાશાઓ કર્યા માટે આ કર નાખવાનો વીચાર કેહેવાય છે.

“ટોડી” ટેક્સ—પુશામત અને આપલુસી કરવાના કામમાં એકાંઠા મણીતા સાહેબો આ કર પુણીથી આપવા નૈયાર થયા છે.

તા. ૧૩ મી જાનેવારી સને ૧૯૬૫



હમણા મુંબઈમાં થતા દરરોજના રેકાસ.



[ ટેકાણું—એક ખાનપાનની કલ્પ. ]

મી. આપલુસીયા—જે લોકો હેરીસને હાથે નામુરાહ ને નાસીપાસ થયલા છે, તે લોકોજ તેની સામે બધી ગરબર કરેય. બાકી હું કેહુંય કે એના જેવો ગવરનર તો ત્રીસ વરસની મુદતમાં આપણને કદી મળ્યાજ નથી.

મી. પુશામતીયા—ખચીત, ખચીત, એલફીનરડન ને ફ્રીયર, ને ટેમપલ ને ફ્રગસન ને રે તો એની આગળ પાણીજ ભરેય. એ તો પેલા બાહુદુરજ ને વાછા, ને ગોખલે ને ખારે, ને સેતલવડ ને ઝંઝરીલાલ જેવા “ડીસેપોઈટ” થયલાઓ તેની સામે બખાળે નહી તો બીજું શું? આજે તે લોકને ઓધા મળે તો કાલે તે લોકખી એની તરફેણમાં થઈ જાય, સમજ્યો !

મી. નરમશી—મ, અ, ખચીત ? તારે આપ સાહેબો જે આજે હેરીસની તારીફનાં ખીત ગાઓય તે શાને માટે ? કે તમારી મુરાહ બર આવી અને તમે ટેકાણું પડી ગયાય, તે માટે કે ? ને સાહેબોના દીકરાઓને સગાવાહાલાઓને ઓધા પર ફસાવી દેવા માટે અલાચીજ એઆનુંખી મુકતા આવોય કે ખા ?

પા. ૫૦ અને પુશામત—( પુખ્ત ટેક્સ પર પ્રોટેસ્ટ કરીને નાનસ-સ ! ચટ નાનસનસ ! એમ કંઈ છેજ નહી ! અમે તો અમુસી “કાન-ગ્રીપસ” પ્રમાણે ચાલ્યેય ને તે જે “પરમીટ” કરેમ તેજ ચાલ્યેય !











